

contract. Would not that be very much more effective in preventing any such condition being embodied in the contract?

Mr. WALSH. I will say to the Senator from Alabama that it would not. That would really be very unfortunate, indeed. Here is a man who is obliged to buy under such a condition. They attach such a condition to his acquisition of the instrument or the machine, and he has a lease of the machine with such a condition in his lease. If you make the entire lease void, then he has not any right to the use of the machine at all, and the seller can come and take it right out of his factory.

Mr. WHITE. But would it not operate as a greater deterrent on the seller or lessor by making the whole contract void and thereby tend to prevent him from insisting on the insertion of any such condition? If the seller or lessor knew he would vitiate his whole contract by inserting the condition, he would not likely insert it.

Mr. WALSH. I should say not. I should say as it is the purchaser or lessee would get all the benefit and the seller or lessor would take all the risk that he might at any time insist upon the validity of the condition.

Mr. WHITE. Provided the lessee or purchaser knew all the time exactly what his rights were, but in the absence of any such knowledge he would go on and perform the contract, whereas if the whole contract was made void then the seller or lessor or licensor would be afraid to make any such contract.

I call the attention of the author of the amendment and the committee to these propositions and I think they are worthy of the consideration both of the committee and of the author of the amendment.

Mr. WALSH. I desire to say to the Senator from Alabama that I have carefully followed him and I am not able to adopt his view.

Mr. WHITE. Very well.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SHIVELY:

A bill (S. 6393) granting an increase of pension to William H. Miller; and

A bill (S. 6394) granting an increase of pension to George W. Brewer (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OVERMAN:

A bill (S. 6395) supplementary to an act entitled "An act to amend section 27 of an act approved December 23, 1913," and known as the Federal reserve act, approved August 4, 1914; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

RECESS.

Mr. KERN. I move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow forenoon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Thursday, August 27, 1914, at 11 o'clock a. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, August 26, 1914.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in heaven, infinite source of all good, we come to Thee in prayer that we may renew our spiritual life and be prepared to meet whatever may come to us. The past is gone, the future a sealed book; help us to wisely improve the present and "go forward to meet the shadowy future with brave and manly hearts." For Thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory forever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

• LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following requests for leave of absence, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SHACKLEFORD requests leave of absence indefinitely on account of illness.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HAYES requests leave of absence until next Monday on account of illness.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FLOOD of Virginia asks leave of absence for one week on account of sickness.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, yesterday the House granted leave of absence to one of our distinguished colleagues, Mr. DICKINSON, of Missouri, I think very properly, and our distinguished Speaker stated that Mr. DICKINSON was sick in bed, and the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. HAMLIN, also stated that he was sick in bed. I simply wish to congratulate Mr. DICKINSON upon his early recovery. The St. Louis newspaper states that he is attending the Democratic convention at Jefferson City, Mo., and at the time the paper went to press was in consideration for chairman of that convention. I am glad to know of his speedy recovery.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of Mr. Flood of Virginia? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WILSON of New York asks leave of absence on account of illness, with certificate of physician attached.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wish to say this: Here is a request for leave of absence on account of sickness, having a physician's certificate attached, which clearly shows that the request should be granted. I want to say this to the House, that when I offered the resolution yesterday to require the Sergeant at Arms to enforce the law, I meant that resolution in earnest, so far as I am concerned, and I intend to see to it that the Sergeant at Arms enforces the law, if I have to call upon the Treasury Department to go after the Sergeant at Arms' bond, if he does not enforce the law. So far as these leaves of absence are concerned, I am not going to interfere with them. If gentlemen think that they can get around the law by asking the House to excuse them they are very badly mistaken. The law puts that authority in the hands of the Sergeant at Arms of this House. If a Member of this House satisfies the Sergeant at Arms that he is absent on account of sickness he ought to be excused, and he will be excused, but the fact that the House excuses a man on account of sickness does not affect the law at all, and if he is not really sick the Sergeant at Arms will make himself liable upon his bond if he grants the excuse. I have notified the Sergeant at Arms this morning that I propose to hold him responsible if he does not enforce this law. I am not going to get up here and raise any objection to these requests for leave of absence on account of sickness or any other ground, because when a Member asks for that leave of absence he puts the Sergeant at Arms of this House upon notice that he is away, and I take it that the Sergeant at Arms' business is to know whether that is a lawful excuse. Therefore I can see that no harm is done by gentlemen asking for leaves of absence.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. MOON. What does the gentleman understand to be the exact language of the law upon this subject?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. If the gentleman will refer to the RECORD this morning, he will find the law printed in the RECORD. I put it in the RECORD yesterday.

Mr. MOON. Was that a law passed by the Congress or a resolution of the House?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It is an enactment of law. It is the fortieth section of the Revised Statutes of the United States, and I will read it to the gentleman.

Mr. MOON. I wanted to know whether it was an enactment of Congress or merely a resolution of the House?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It is an enactment of Congress. Some gentlemen may not have been here yesterday. This is a law that has been upon the statute books a great many years, and it is found in section 40 of the Revised Statutes, and reads as follows, being found on page 15539 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday:

SEC. 40. The Secretary of the Senate and Sergeant at Arms of the House, respectively, shall deduct from the monthly payments of each Member or Delegate the amount of his salary for each day that he has been absent from the Senate or House, respectively, unless such Member or Delegate assigns as the reason for such absence the sickness of himself or of some member of his family.

That is a question for the Sergeant at Arms of this House to determine.

Mr. MOON. I want to say to the gentleman from Alabama that I am not desiring any leave of absence, but there are a great many gentlemen here who are under the impression that the resolution which was offered yesterday was not based upon permanent law. I presumed that it was, and for that reason I called attention to it.

Mr. HAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. HAY. The law reads:

Unless such Member or Delegate assigns as the reason for such absence the sickness of himself or of some member of his family.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. HAY. If the Member assigns that reason, what power has the Sergeant at Arms to say that he is not sick. Has he the power to have him visited by a physician?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No.

Mr. HAY. To begin an inquisition into his physical condition?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No; I think not.

Mr. HAY. Very well, then; when a Member assigns to the Sergeant at Arms or states to him that he is sick, and, therefore, is unable to attend upon the proceedings of the House, what can the Sergeant at Arms do?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. He can not do anything; but I take this to be the fact, that the Sergeant at Arms of this House will require a statement from the Members of the House as to how many days they have been in attendance, in order that he may enforce the law, and if a Member of this House states on his authority as a Member that he has been sick the Sergeant at Arms will take his word for it, just as the gentleman or myself would take his word for it.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. I understood the gentleman to say that he proposed to see that the Sergeant at Arms enforces the law?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do.

Mr. MANN. And that the Sergeant at Arms would be liable upon his bond if he failed to enforce the law?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Well, of course passing the resolution yesterday directing the Sergeant at Arms to enforce the law did not change the law—

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Not at all.

Mr. MANN. Nor the duty of the Sergeant at Arms?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Not at all.

Mr. MANN. So that when the gentleman says he will be liable if he has not enforced the law, the Sergeant at Arms of the present House must be liable for not having enforced the law from the beginning of the present term of Congress.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Well, that may be true; I do not say that is not true.

Mr. MANN. Of course if, as the gentleman said, he would see that the law is enforced, I do not know what process he would adopt; but suppose some other Member of the House should endeavor to do the same thing against the Sergeant at Arms from the beginning of the term of Congress, it would be pretty hard on the Sergeant at Arms?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Of course that is a matter that I am not concerned about.

Mr. MANN. But the Sergeant at Arms is concerned about it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think that he is; and the Sergeant at Arms and every Member of this House was aware of this law months ago.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will.

Mr. MANN. Assuming that the Sergeant at Arms may not be to blame for not having enforced the law until the House passed the resolution directing him so to do, as I understand it he can not enforce the law until the end of the month, the time when it comes to make payments of salary. If he enforces the law at the end of this month, on the 4th of next month, when payments become due, of course he will have to make a deduction from the beginning of the month.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am not passing on this question as a lawyer, because—

Mr. MANN. There can not be any question about it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois, as I understand the proposition, the Sergeant at Arms can withhold, if he sees proper to do so, the money of any Member of this House who has been absent without excuse of sickness of himself or family at any time up to the end of this Congress. He could take out, for instance, the last two months' salary entirely if he wanted to do it; that is the law; and I do not think there is a dispute on that question.

Mr. MANN. I think it is the duty of the Sergeant at Arms at the end of the month to require each Member of the House to make a certificate covering the entire month.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. MANN. As I understand what was done in the Fifty-third Congress was that the Speaker directed the Sergeant at Arms to enforce this law, and the Sergeant at Arms sent a cer-

tificate to each Member of the House for signature containing a copy of the law and a certificate covering the absences for which deductions should be made in accordance with the terms of the law. I am frank to say that yesterday I advised one of the officials of the office of the Sergeant at Arms who asked me that I thought he could properly under the conditions use the same kind of a certificate now that was used by the Democratic Sergeant at Arms in the Fifty-third Congress, following the precedent then set.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Well, I think that is true. The only reason I rose was in view of the number of requests for leave of absence on account of sickness some one might want to know why I did not object as I was trying to enforce this rule, and I merely want to say to the House and call their attention to the fact that the action of the House is not to govern. It is a question between the Member and the Sergeant at Arms—

Mr. MANN. Absolutely.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Therefore it makes no material difference whether we grant the leaves of absence or not.

Mr. MANN. It is a question of honor on the part of the Member who makes the certificate. He can evade the law and get his money; but will he?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not think he will.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. In view of the fact that the salary of each Member of Congress is fixed by law and can be changed only by law and can not be changed by the Sergeant at Arms, if the certificate which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] has just mentioned should be presented to a Member of Congress who has been here every day and he should fail to sign that certificate or to make a report to the Sergeant at Arms, is there any way by which the Sergeant at Arms or anybody else could deprive that Member of his salary in full?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think so. I think the law does.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. If the Member of Congress is here every day and fails to make the certificate?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I am bound to disagree with the gentleman.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The law says the Sergeant at Arms shall withhold the pay, and that contemplates that the Sergeant at Arms—

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. The Sergeant at Arms can withhold the pay, only because of the absence and not for failure to make report. There is no law requiring a Member to make any report to the Sergeant at Arms.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think the Sergeant at Arms would be entitled to a reasonable opportunity to ascertain the facts.

Mr. HOWARD. Will the gentleman from Alabama yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will.

Mr. HOWARD. What effect, if any, would the granting of leaves of absence by the House have upon a Member's status as to this peculiar situation?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. None whatever, in my judgment.

Mr. HOWARD. Then it is simply unnecessary for a Member to obtain leave from the House under any condition?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. He might obtain leave for other reasons. Even if it is costing him \$25 a day, the House might send the Sergeant at Arms after him and bring him back, anyhow.

Mr. HOWARD. Suppose a Member of Congress should obtain leave of absence for other reasons than sickness of himself or members of his family, what would be the status then?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. It would notify the Sergeant at Arms absolutely that he was forfeiting \$25 a day.

Mr. FERRIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will.

Mr. FERRIS. I wanted to ask the gentleman if he did not think in the face of the custom that has grown up, that has been followed by everybody, the Sergeant at Arms had performed his full duty if he exacted from a Member a certificate reaching back to the date of the adoption of the gentleman's resolution? It will not affect me, I will state, but it will work a little easier.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. As this is the law, I can not pass on that proposition. Of course the House relieved the Sergeant at Arms of some responsibility by directing the Sergeant at Arms to enforce the law. He has to do it now by the order of the House.

Mr. FERRIS. True. We do and say things here under the pressure of the moment that might lead an administrative officer of the House to do something he should not do. While it does not affect me one way or another personally, as I have not been outside of the Capital this year, I do not think this House ought to exact of the Sergeant at Arms that he go back

of the resolution and work a hardship on a lot of Members who have a right to rely on what has been the custom.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That is for the Sergeant at Arms. The Sergeant at Arms started in yesterday in accordance with the resolution.

Mr. SIMS. The statute says "absent from his seat" instead of being absent from Washington. If a Member comes in here and answers one roll call and is absent from his seat the balance of the day, is he relieved by that one appearance?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Why does he have to answer to a roll call? It is known that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], for instance, is here to-day. Everybody knows it as a matter of record. How can he be charged for absence to-day if he fails to answer to a roll call, or if the Sergeant at Arms should undertake to "dock" him for to-day because he should fail to make such statement as the Sergeant at Arms might require of him?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The law does not say where he shall be absent from.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of no quorum.

Mr. BOOHER. Will the gentleman yield for just a moment?

Mr. MADDEN. I make the point of no quorum, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BOOHER. Will the gentleman withhold that for just a moment?

Mr. MADDEN. I will withhold it for a moment at the request of the gentleman from Missouri.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. WILSON]?

Mr. MANN. Has Mr. WILSON been sick all winter?

The SPEAKER. He has been sick most of the session.

Mr. MANN. And absent?

The SPEAKER. He has been sick and absent most of the session.

Mr. MANN. Are all the rest of the New York Members sick, too? [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. The Chair has no information about any of them except this Member.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. WILSON]? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask unanimous consent that Mr. FOWLER, of Illinois, be excused for the day on account of sickness. He is confined to his bed, and his little daughter told me that he is under the care of a physician this morning.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following request, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

AUGUST 26, 1914.

Mr. BLACKMON asks leave of absence for the day on account of sickness.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BLACKMON]? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] makes a point of order.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. He will withhold it for a moment. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the resolution of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Dakota asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on this salary question. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CALLING OF THE ROLL.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to make the point of no quorum.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] makes the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the gentleman from Illinois to reserve that for a moment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and fifty-five Members are present—not a quorum.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Adair	Ansberry	Austin	Barkley
Aiken	Anthony	Baltz	Bartholdt
Ainey	Aswell	Barchfeld	Bartlett

Beall, Tex.	Fitzgerald	Kindel	Peterson
Bell, Ga.	Flood, Va.	Kirkpatrick	Phelan
Blackmon	Foster	Knowland, J. R.	Plumley
Brockson	Fowler	Konop	Porter
Brown, N. Y.	Francis	Kreider	Powers
Browne, Wis.	Gallivan	Lafferty	Ragsdale
Browning	Gard	Langham	Rainey
Brumbaugh	Gardner	Langley	Riordan
Bulkeley	George	Lazaro	Rogers
Byrnes, S. C.	Gerry	L'Engle	Rubey
Calder	Gill	Lenroot	Russell
Campbell	Gilmore	Levy	Sabath
Cantor	Glass	Lewis, Pa.	Saunders
Carew	Graham, Ill.	Lindquist	Shackelford
Church	Graham, Pa.	Loft	Sherley
Clancy	Green, Iowa	McAndrews	Sherwood
Cooper	Griest	McGillcuddy	Shreve
Copley	Gudger	McGuire, Okla.	Smith, Saml. W.
Covington	Guernsey	McKenzie	Smith, N. Y.
Cramton	Hamilton, Mich.	Mahan	Steenerson
Crisp	Hamilton, N. Y.	Maher	Stout
Decker	Hardwick	Martin	Stringer
Dickinson	Hayden	Merritt	Switzer
Dies	Hayes	Metz	Ten Eyck
Diffenderfer	Helgesen	Miller	Thacher
Dillon	Hensley	Morgan, La.	Treadway
Dixon	Hill	Morin	Underhill
Dooling	Hinds	Mott	Vare
Doolittle	Hinebaugh	Murdock	Wallin
Doremus	Hobson	Murray, Mass.	Watkins
Eagle	Hoxworth	Neeley, Kans.	Whaley
Elder	Hullings	Nolan, J. I.	Whitacre
Esch	Igoe	O'Brien	Willis
Estopinal	Johnson, S. C.	O'Leary	Wilson, N. Y.
Fairchild	Kelley, Mich.	Padgett	Winslow
Faison	Kelly, Pa.	Parker	Woodruff
Fess	Kennedy, R. I.	Patton, Pa.	
Finley	Kent	Peters	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 270 Members—a quorum—have answered to their names.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama moves to dispense with further proceedings under the call. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will open the doors.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask leave of absence for one week for my colleague, Mr. GALLIVAN, on account of the illness of his son.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. BOWDLE rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Ohio rise? To object?

Mr. BOWDLE. No.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. BOWDLE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Marine News, of New York, entitled "American subsidies to foreign ships." It is a brief editorial. Together with that I would like to have printed an equally brief response of my own.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing an article from the Marine News, and also an answer to that article, on the subject of "American subsidies to foreign ships." Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOSS of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the resolution as to absent Members introduced by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] yesterday.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOSS] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks on the Underwood resolution. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Judge WATKINS, obtained a leave of absence on the 6th of August, having been called to his home by the serious illness of his daughter. On his arrival there he found it necessary to accompany her to New Mexico. It is impossible for him to return at this time, and I ask for an indefinite leave of absence for him under the circumstances. There has been no more faithful Member of the House in attendance than Judge WATKINS.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DUPRÉ] asks for leave of absence for Mr. WATKINS, on account of the serious illness of his daughter. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY—CODIFICATION OF THE PRINTING LAWS.

The SPEAKER. This is Calendar Wednesday, and the unfinished business is the bill H. R. 15902. The House automatically resolves itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. PAGE] in the chair.

Thereupon the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 15902) to amend, revise, and codify the laws relating to the public printing and binding and the distribution of Government publications, with Mr. PAGE of North Carolina in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 15902, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 15902) to amend, revise, and codify the laws relating to the public printing and binding and the distribution of Government publications.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, under the agreement I ask for recognition for one hour.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] is recognized.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield of my time three-quarters of an hour to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN] is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman from Nebraska commences I would like to inquire of the gentleman from Wisconsin if it is his understanding that he is to use an hour now? If the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] comes in with an hour and another hour is taken, what situation will that leave us in?

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman will allow, the Chair will state that according to the statements of Members on the floor last Wednesday an agreement for 3 hours was reached for general debate. The gentleman from Wisconsin asked for 30 minutes, and that was included in the agreement.

Mr. STAFFORD. I stated in the Record—and the Record will bear me out—that I wanted an hour, of which I said I would yield three-quarters of an hour. Then the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART] stated that he would reserve 15 minutes for the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KIESS] and 1 hour for the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD].

Mr. BARNHART. I stated that I would want 15 minutes reserved for the committee. I think the gentleman from Wisconsin fully understood it, that he might want to use three-quarters of an hour.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman from Indiana desire further time?

Mr. BARNHART. That would depend, Mr. Chairman. If there should be any proposition put forth, I thought I might use 15 minutes or I might not use any. My colleague on the committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KIESS], wants 15 minutes. Further than that I do not know that the committee wants any time.

Mr. MANN. Why would it not be practical now, the order of debate having been agreed to in the committee and not in the House, to extend the time now, so that the gentleman will have the time?

Mr. BARNHART. I understand from the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] that he will not want any extension if the gentleman from New York is not here.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN] is recognized for 45 minutes.

CORN IMPORTATIONS—CORN TARIFF.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, in the summer of 1912 labor was well employed, prices were good, and all our industries were being conducted with activity and fair profit. These conditions satisfied a large number of American people. A political party, striving for preferment, demanding opportunity to assume control of public affairs, declared there should be a radical change wrought in the course of our industries. It promised, if opportunity were given, to better the industrial and commercial interests of the country.

The moving reason given by that party was that the "cost of living" was too high. "Cost of living" relates to all articles which enter directly or indirectly into the sustenance, comfort, and prudent enjoyment which make up proper American life. It includes food and drink, raiment and shelter, education and enjoyment. It is necessarily based upon production, transportation, change of form, and exchange.

That the "cost of living" was to be reduced was written large in the Baltimore platform, reiterated in the partisan press,

and thundered from the platform throughout the campaign. The "cost of living" was to be reduced by radical tariff changes. Other issues were tendered, but were subordinate to the tariff. The party thus seeking power by reason of a divided opposition and its flattering promise succeeded at the polls. Both Houses of Congress and the Executive were Democratic, and the course of legislation for the large purpose was opened.

In preparing a bill which was to state definitely, first, the vice complained of, and second, the remedy therefor, they drafted and introduced at a special session called by the President for April 7, 1913, what was known as the Underwood and later as the Underwood-Simmons tariff bill, a tariff bill which I charge to be the foreigners' fraudulent bill of rights, which a future Congress will repeal, and a farmers' bill of wrongs, which the people will redress. [Applause on the Republican side.] The Ways and Means Committee considered what were the principal offenders among matters of industry and commerce and graded them according to the gravity of their alleged offending. In doing so, the majority members of that committee presented in their report, supporting the Underwood bill, on page 3, the following:

Certain distinct economic developments between the years of 1897 and 1913 must be studied in close connection with the working of the tariff law.

INCREASE IN COST OF LIVING.

"Probably the most striking economic change since 1897 has been the tremendous increase in the cost of living—a situation which has attracted the anxious attention of economists the world over. The following figures represent the relative advance in living costs that has taken place during the critical part of the period in question in the United States."

Relative to wholesale prices and per cent of increase over 1897.

Commodity.	Price, 1897.	Price, 1900.	Increase over 1897.	Price, 1910.	Increase over 1897.
Farm products.....	85.2	100.5	28.5	164.6	93.2
Food.....	87.7	104.2	18.8	123.7	46.7
Clothing.....	91.1	106.8	17.2	123.7	35.8
Metals and implements.....	86.6	120.5	39.1	128.5	48.2
Drugs and chemicals.....	94.4	115.7	22.5	117.0	23.9
House furnishing goods.....	89.8	106.1	18.1	111.6	24.2
Miscellaneous.....	92.1	109.8	19.2	133.1	44.5
All commodities.....	89.7	110.5	23.1	131.6	46.7

The committee, with the foregoing as a basis for assault, then proceeded to penalize the various classes of articles by reducing or removing the duties according to the following considerations:

First. Apparent increase of price during the existence of the Dingley and Payne laws.

Second. According to the degree of energy and zeal or the lack of them with which the majority committee members defended or did not defend articles considered.

Apparently, following this rule, the committee placed a large number of articles upon the free list. Nearly 80 per cent in value of these were farm products.

Second. Radical reductions were made in numerous articles, a large portion of which were farm products.

Third. There were reductions in other schedules, but none so radical as those included in the term "farm products."

This procedure was fundamentally inequitable, because, while farm products had apparently advanced in price a greater percentage since 1897 than any of the other divisions, yet it will be recalled that the fall in prices of farm products from 1892 to 1897 had been much greater than any other division or classification of articles considered. They were entitled to a greater percentage of advance than those which had not been so far reduced in that period. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The greatest of all farm products in this country is corn, and 100 per cent, or all of the tariff, was removed from it.

Mr. GORDON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SLOAN. I will yield for this question, but my time is shorter than my matter, and after that I prefer not to yield.

Mr. GORDON. Is it your contention that the reduction of the tariff on farm products has reduced the price of them?

Mr. SLOAN. My contention will appear quite clearly, I think, and the evidence that I will present here from two distinguished witnesses from the gentleman's own State shows that the importation of corn in this country reduced the price of marketable corn in the United States at least 10 cents a bushel.

During the discussion of the bill I presented two amendments relative to corn, one to remove it from its free-list place in the bill, and, second, to retain a duty of 10 cents a bushel. The former duty was 15 cents. This would not have been in violation of any national platform pledge. The removal was a violation of all of them. Each of these amendments was voted

down in Committee of the Whole by practically a party vote, the Democrats voting against and Republicans and Progressives voting in favor.

It was shown that imports of corn, while not large under the old law, were increasing from year to year while paying a duty of 15 cents a bushel.

No one claimed any virtue in throwing away the revenue which might be collected. The majority pressed the necessity of cheapening it to the buyer. A Member of Congress who should have risen in his place and said, "I am in favor of throwing away the revenue, and the corn prices will not be affected," would have been smiled at by every Member of the majority side.

Why Members like the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RAINY] now stand on the floor of the House and try to tell the farmers that they did not intend and had not injured them is hard to understand. The manly course would be to say, "We placed corn on the free list to reduce the price to the noncorn-producing communities. We expect those people to save us in the day of the farmers' wrath."

It was a canny Scot who had long followed sinful ways until he was on terms of intimacy with "Auld Nick." Sandy finally made profession and joined the "kirk." A short time after he met "Auld Nick," who soundly upbraided him for deserting the cause. Said Sandy, "Not quite so fast, auld friend. 'Tis true I joined the kirk. To it I'll make profession; but I'll do the work for ye." The gentleman from Illinois professes much to the farmer, but when he made the corn tariff he did the work for the other fellow. [Laughter.]

The committee having laid out the basis for its work, forecasted the result of their legislation in the following significant statement found on page 18 of the tariff report:

In our judgment the future growth of our great industries lies beyond the seas.

That tariff report was signed by 14 majority members of the Ways and Means Committee. These two statements of alleged cause and forecasted effect are interesting in the light of subsequent corn events. Between the enactment of the Underwood law and July 1, 1914, practically nine months elapsed. There was imported into the United States 11,843,166 bushels of corn, which was an increase of 4.210 per cent over the corresponding nine months' period of the preceding fiscal year. The greatest importation for any full year prior thereto was 903,062 bushels. It is predicted by Congressman HAMMOND and others that 21,000,000 bushels will be imported the first year of the new tariff law. Under conditions the estimate is not unreasonable.

Ninety-three per cent of the importations came from Argentina. That country lies in a latitude south corresponding to our own north, except that with a long eastern coast it has a greater stretch of latitude than has the United States. Argentina is a wonderful country, both in its activities and products, and has a prospect greater than almost any other country in the world. Especially is this true so far as meat and cereal productions are concerned. Its boundless grassy plains feed vast herds of sheep, cattle, and horses. Its fertile soil responds to the intelligent efforts of the husbandman, producing rich returns in corn, wheat, oats, and alfalfa, rivaling our prairie farms of the Northwest. There products greatly exceed the domestic demands, and its large surpluses seek the markets of the world. Especially is this true of corn, beef, and wheat.

As the canal is completed, Argentina is preparing to battle for our coast-city grain markets on both sides of the continent. She has recently complied with the reciprocal demands of our wheat tariff, so by the removal of her wheat-products duty her wheat, like her corn and beef, can enter our ports absolutely free.

In Argentina's contest with the United States for the control of the free markets of the world for beef, the following table is a graphic account of its course and outcome:

Exports of beef from United States and Argentina to the United Kingdom for certain years.

	United States.	Argentina.
	Hundredweight.	Hundredweight.
1901.....	3,180,291	771,929
1902.....	2,290,465	923,748
1903.....	2,693,920	1,152,211
1904.....	2,395,836	1,675,271
1905.....	2,232,206	2,580,152
1906.....	2,426,344	2,795,913
1907.....	2,417,604	2,756,905
1908.....	1,432,142	3,706,245
1909.....	856,805	4,336,079
1910.....	477,147	5,041,138
1911.....	174,350	6,176,503
1912.....	6,111	6,813,578

It will be noted that in 1901 we were shipping to the United Kingdom 4 pounds to Argentina's 1, while in 1912 they shipped

1,100 pounds to our 1. This suggests why there has come into our free ports since the Underwood tariff law went into effect, and prior to July 1, 1914, 176,333,072 pounds of beef, and of all meats a total of 193,618,598 pounds. Thus is the battle transferred from London, Liverpool, and Glasgow to New York, Philadelphia, Boston, and Baltimore, while Australia wages a similar contest at Seattle, San Francisco, and Los Angeles.

With the duty barrier removed, the corn contest between the United States and Argentina must take a somewhat similar course. The following table indicates in three representative recent years the relative shipments of corn into the United Kingdom by the United States and Argentina:

Exports of corn from United States and Argentina to the United Kingdom for certain years.

	United States.	Argentina.
	Bushels.	Bushels.
1910.....	10,667,812	5,485,194
1912.....	7,834,599	13,464,204
1913.....	14,106,720	127,364,857

¹ Trade figures.

It will be noticed that in 1910 we were shipping 2 bushels for Argentina's 1. In 1913 we were shipping 1 bushel to Argentina's 2, and undoubtedly the figures for 1914 will show a much greater ratio in favor of Argentina and against the United States, probably 20 to 1.

As in beef, the corn contest will be shifted from the great free ports of the United Kingdom to the now free ports of the United States.

In the United States in 1913 only 17.3 per cent of our crop, which was 2,446,988,000 bushels, was removed to markets outside of the immediate community in which it was grown. That part amounts to 422,328,924 bushels. Every farmer and grain man knows that every bushel of this amount competes as a market factor with every other bushel of this class. The competition is, of course, affected by the elements of quality, time, and expense of conveying to market. There is not now and has not been heretofore any tariff between any of the States, and in the removal of the duty by the Underwood bill this exemption of tariffs has simply been extended to the world, so far as corn is concerned.

Relatively speaking, little corn and no surplus is produced in any of the seaboard States, where 49 per cent of the people live and where 34 per cent of the cattle, 22 per cent of sheep, 27 per cent of hogs, and 23 per cent of horses are. Sixty-four per cent of the corn is raised in and practically all the United States surplus is moved from the following Northwestern States:

Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota, and Wisconsin.

This corn under the old law primarily competed for the seaboard markets of the country. While the bulk of Nebraska or Kansas corn did not actually reach New York or Philadelphia, every bushel of this surplus competed in effect with every bushel of Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, and Ohio corn which did reach the great consuming points; because if Indiana, Illinois, Iowa, and Ohio corn did not respond to the fair offers of New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, and Boston, then would Nebraska and Kansas corn be diverted to that market, they being handicapped by a larger freight rate, but at the same time favored by somewhat cheaper land. The same thing is true concerning corn competition among the nations. Every bushel of corn not reasonably required for home consumption is an actual or potential competitor with every bushel of surplus in every other country in the world for those free markets and, to some extent, for those markets charging a duty for importation. But usually that duty is much larger than the difference in transportation, and for that reason hitherto the 15 cents per bushel duty on corn has kept our importations reasonably low.

Corn being the largest and the coarsest of the food cereals, and with a history of uniform less price per pound than the other leading grains, the item of freight becomes a relatively greater factor in corn price than in any of the other grains. The freight rate from the center of the corn surplus producing district to or near the seaboard would be 12 to 14 cents per bushel. From Omaha to the seaboard it is 15 to 18 cents.

From—	To—					
	Boston	New York.	Philadelphia.	Baltimore.	Galveston.	New Orleans
	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.	Cents.
Omaha.....	0.18	0.17	0.16	0.15	0.19	0.11
Kansas City.....	.17	.16	.15	.14	.17	.10
Chicago.....	.10	.08	.07	.07	.18	.10

The foregoing rates were furnished by the Interstate Commerce Commission and are higher than figures quoted in the 1912 Yearbook, and which I used on a former occasion. The freight rate from Argentine ports to our ports, not being controlled by any law and corn being carried as a combined ballast and revenue producer, costs from 3 to 5 cents per bushel. So Argentine corn starting from its ports have a great advantage in entering our ports over that sent from the interior points in the United States burdened by heavy railway freight rates. Account should be taken of the increase of shipping to South America and the special effort now being made to market our manufactured articles in that quarter. This will make it especially desirable to load the vessels for the return voyage and corn will furnish the ballast and cargo at once. This point is especially accentuated by the fact that for years Argentina has been cultivating and developing a hard dry corn grain especially adapted to being carried through the heat and moisture of the Tropics.

I acknowledge indebtedness to the Congressman from Illinois [Mr. RAINEY] for bringing samples of Argentine corn on the floor of the House for inspection on the 6th day of June, 1914. That his purpose was in the nature of derision rather than showing its adaptation for safe and profitable shipment by Argentina, does not materially reduce my gratitude. The average annual amount of corn shipped between the various nations of the earth the last 10 years has been 245,557,706 bushels. It is about 38 per cent of the international shipment of wheat. The following is the rank of nations in corn production:

United States, Argentina, Mexico, Austria-Hungary, Russia, Roumania, Italy, and Africa.

And the following is a list of the important corn-exporting nations in the order of their rank:

Argentina, United States, Roumania, Russia, Bulgaria, Belgium, and Netherlands.

The following table shows the course of exports of the two leading nations for 10 years:

Calendar years.	Argentina.	United States.
	<i>Bushels.</i>	<i>Bushels.</i>
1904.....	97,221,000	90,203,000
1905.....	87,487,000	113,189,000
1906.....	106,047,000	105,258,000
1907.....	50,262,000	86,524,000
1908.....	67,390,000	39,013,000
1909.....	89,499,000	38,114,000
1910.....	104,727,000	44,072,000
1911.....	4,928,000	63,533,000
1912.....	190,353,000	32,649,000
1913.....	189,294,000	46,923,000

If the above decade be divided into three periods of three, three, and four years, there will appear some significant facts:

Importation of corn by certain principal countries for last 10 years, with average for the 10 years, together with the import duty collected by the different countries at the present time.

	1903	1904	1905	1906	1907	1908	1909	1910	1911	1912	Average for 10 years.	Rate of duty in dollars per bushel.
	<i>Bushels.</i>	<i>Bushels.</i>	<i>Bushels.</i>	<i>Bushels.</i>	<i>Bushels.</i>	<i>Bushels.</i>	<i>Bushels.</i>	<i>Bushels.</i>	<i>Bushels.</i>	<i>Bushels.</i>	<i>Bushels.</i>	
Austria-Hungary.....	11,130,274	14,090,377	18,511,368	7,118,221	4,002,712	3,106,663	4,050,645	2,494,032	7,886,000	23,108,000	10,144,829	\$0.144
Belgium.....	20,323,893	19,474,330	24,169,780	20,125,507	23,505,832	19,158,096	22,099,818	25,035,630	21,814,000	32,021,000	23,072,788	Free.
Canada.....	11,333,530	12,003,574	11,779,679	15,233,894	16,187,579	6,812,833	7,563,688	10,767,402	16,440,000	9,331,000	11,745,317	Free.
Union of South Africa.....	3,471,281	1,236,927	2,171,601	215,007	51,298	145,275	155,389	69,463	29,000	141,000	768,621	.272
Cuba.....	619,326	696,517	1,843,348	2,489,087	3,153,495	1,837,974	2,249,995	3,002,432	2,388,000	2,388,000	2,066,817	.069
Denmark.....	8,772,022	9,284,777	10,859,257	18,855,752	2,383,282	10,445,555	9,151,750	7,217,422	11,085,000	13,809,000	10,186,381	Free.
Egypt.....	142,537	53,017	1,279,749	1,438,435	196,539	845,205	748,865	83,038	227,000	110,000	512,438	(¹)
France.....	11,347,114	10,124,353	11,122,512	14,509,103	16,850,618	9,629,979	11,213,413	15,355,323	19,742,000	23,951,000	14,384,523	.147
Germany.....	37,527,343	30,450,853	36,533,398	44,883,053	49,293,029	26,372,295	27,833,917	22,562,742	29,267,000	44,973,000	4,970,159	.181
Italy.....	15,092,527	8,365,123	5,902,875	8,666,763	2,815,120	2,987,496	8,459,988	15,756,325	15,118,000	21,283,000	10,444,721	.367
Mexico.....	496,028	476,182	1,454,327	2,079,553	1,554,145	179,157	1,169,733	8,907,181	9,050,000	1,548,000	2,691,230	.066
Netherlands.....	20,160,078	16,547,198	16,231,785	25,345,233	29,192,195	25,261,400	22,914,269	21,511,620	25,743,000	38,262,000	24,113,177	Free.
Norway.....	765,246	555,991	544,506	718,277	1,937,926	809,841	965,347	788,600	1,019,000	1,471,000	957,582	Free.
Portugal.....	396,605	531,889	2,724,050	370,611	677,726	2,015,338	2,337,800	518,042	418,000	932,000	1,084,211	.429
Russia.....	457,715	625,326	163,979	437,868	550,841	355,769	174,760	180,924	339,000	182,000	346,833	.240
Spain.....	1,484,430	2,761,426	1,904,186	2,647,975	4,552,178	3,320,040	6,411,002	7,526,303	5,685,000	6,851,000	4,314,360	.110
Sweden.....	189,357	234,988	491,035	564,946	333,588	488,077	272,284	277,160	460,000	2,460,000	376,843	Free.
Switzerland.....	2,611,202	2,704,457	2,498,380	2,887,291	2,867,764	2,480,164	3,143,216	3,605,403	4,039,000	4,342,000	3,119,887	.014
United Kingdom.....	101,284,919	86,076,697	84,156,490	97,736,852	106,708,048	68,186,271	78,057,368	73,486,852	77,479,000	88,166,000	86,133,849	Free.
Argentina.....												Free.
Brazil.....												.374
Chile.....												.301
Venezuela.....												.845

¹ Not for purposes of distillation. Corn for purposes of distillation dutiable at 7½ cents per bushel.

² Estimated.

³ Preferential rate applicable to the United States, representing 70 per cent of general rate.

⁴ 8 per cent ad valorem.

⁵ White corn.

⁶ Yellow corn.

Of total average imports of corn for 10 years (241,434,506 bushels), 156,585,937 bushels were imported by countries where it was admitted free; 84,848,629 bushels, or 35 per cent, went into countries where duty had to be paid.

First, in 1904, 1905, and 1906 Argentina exported 0.94 bushels to United States 1; second, in 1907, 1908, and 1909 Argentina exported 1.26 bushels to United States 1; third, in 1910, 1911, 1912, and 1913 Argentina exported 2.63 bushels to United States 1.

It will be seen from the foregoing that Argentina is progressively outstripping the United States, which Nation is gradually coming to consume its own production. For 1914 definite figures, of course, are unavailable, but will be in the neighborhood of 30 for Argentina to 1 for the United States.

The importance of grain tariffs was seen by those who looked forward to the time when we would consume in this country nearly all of our food production. It was expected to be of value to the producers then. That time is here, as the next table will demonstrate, but the friends who looked ahead to this period and condition and sought to safeguard the producers find themselves out of power. Those in power, regardless of the producers, have taken the first opportunity to remove the measure of protection which had been wisely made against the day of evenly balanced production and consumption. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. HAMMOND], one of the rather reluctant co-authors of the Underwood farm schedule, whose efforts had saved conditionally a fragment of the wheat protection, speaking from the gubernatorial storm cellar to which he has fled, said [laughter]:

Of course we may expect importations of wheat from Argentina and Canada. We imported wheat before the enactment of the Underwood tariff bill, and we will continue to import it. Our consumption is increasing, and year by year we send less of our wheat abroad, and in the natural course of things the imports will be greater and greater as the consumption in this country increases, because the increase in production is not keeping up with the increase in consumption.

If the observation of Congressman HAMMOND was warranted as to wheat, how much more emphatically does it apply to corn, the increased production of which should be encouraged, as will appear from the following table:

Average percentage of United States wheat and corn crops exported, based on 5-year periods.

	Per cent of wheat exported.	Per cent of corn exported.
1894-1898.....	33.3	7
1899-1903.....	31.2	5.2
1904-1908.....	17	2.9
1909-1913.....	14.9	1.5

The following table shows the importations of corn by European nations for 10 years, together with the rate of duty charged:

It will be observed that Argentina is the only large corn-producing country excepting our own which does not levy a protective duty upon corn.

It will be noted that for 1912 Argentina exported 51 per cent of all corn exported in the world, while the United States shows that year 8 per cent.

In the first full year of the Underwood tariff law the importations of corn, estimated, will amount to 21,000,000 bushels, which is 8 per cent of the average international shipments of corn by all the nations of the earth for the last 10 years ending with 1912, complete world exports for 1913 or thereafter not being available. A reasonable estimate for 1914 would be, Argentina 75 per cent, United States 2½ per cent.

It will be noted that heretofore corn shipped to the free ports has not greatly exceeded that shipped to the protected ones; but that is changing. Corn producers look with considerable concern, first, on the greatly increased importation of the United States; second, the prospect for greater increase; third, the vast advantage which must accrue to our producing rivals, with none to ourselves; and, fourth, the discouragement to them at being required to produce on high-priced land with high-priced labor, and convey to market at high freight rates, and there compete with the product of low-priced land, low-paid labor, and low freights.

Argentina can afford to carry her corn past Brazil to New York, because if she stopped at Brazil she would have to pay to enter 37 cents per bushel. She could not afford to send it to Chile, as the duty there would be 30 cents per bushel, and the duty of 84 cents per bushel at Venezuela would prohibit her stopping there. So she can ship past every South American port to the United States, as the ocean freight is less to New York than the duty demanded in South American ports.

To all students of corn commerce, the export corn of the world is a large factor in fixing its price throughout corn-using countries. When Congressman RAINEY, from the corn belt of Illinois, a member of the Ways and Means Committee, on June 6, 1914, attempted to defend placing corn on the free list, he spent a great deal of time discussing the amount of corn imported since the tariff law went into effect. His basis of reasoning seemed to be that the imported corn bore but a slight comparison to the corn produced in the United States. That logic might satisfy Members living in the cities of the East, free traders of the South, or Northwestern Democratic Members who seek a palliation of their agricultural constituents' wrath. It would neither satisfy nor deceive any man who understands the corn business. If comparisons are to be made with the element of imports used as a price-fixing influence, the other facts of most importance are, first, how much corn in the United States is sold and moved out of the community of its production; second, how much corn is moved in international trade; third, how much of that corn can be taken at the free ports of the world; and, fourth, how much must be disposed of to countries collecting a duty. Figures illustrating these facts I have already presented.

I submitted two inquiries to the defender of free corn, Mr. RAINEY, of Illinois. First, would he tell the House or furnish for the RECORD statistics of the world exports. This he consented to do if he should regard the statement of sufficient importance. He did not furnish the information, so we must assume that he regarded the corn released from local demands throughout the world and ready for export to any inviting market had nothing to do with fixing or influencing the price of corn at any of these free markets or their vicinities.

The second inquiry was: He having attempted to show that the price of corn was not affected by the imports, why it seemed necessary to throw away 15 cents per bushel revenue which ought to be welcome at our rapidly depleting Treasury. A few million dollars revenue paid for the importation of corn ought to have appealed strongly enough to a tariff-for-revenue-only Democrat and overcome his prejudice against the producer. Permit me to say in passing that the whole theory of the Underwood tariff bill was to favor the consumer and injure or neglect the producer. It is needless to say that that inquiry was not squarely answered nor is it any discredit to the gentleman from Illinois that he has been unable to do so. It would be a reflection upon him and every member of the majority party to say that an extra session was called at large expense to the Government, a bill drafted and passed which released many millions of revenue and did not affect the commercial status in matter of price of the articles of import so largely increased.

That the importation of Argentine corn reduced the price from 8 to 15 cents a bushel is believed by men who understand the

grain trade. Every market paper in the United States in quoting prices of corn from day to day refer to the Argentine shipments as an influential factor in influencing prices. During the seven months of this year the market papers have been quoting, as influencing the corn market, Argentine shipments and the prospects of rain or drought. Rainy weather tended to depress corn prices, just like Rainey legislation tended to bring down prices. In the first case, if prices fell the farmer was compensated in increased yield; but in the second instance the price was sent down with no increase of product. One was the benign blessing from heaven, the other the malign act of man. [Applause.]

For decades market papers of the United Kingdom have daily noted the influence upon corn quotations in that Empire of the Argentine crop—in prospect, harvest, and in transit. The markets of America are now in precisely the same condition relative to Argentine corn as the markets of the United Kingdom. The facts are that the importation of corn between October 3, 1913, and October 3, 1914, from Argentina to the United States will probably be greater than the average importation from the same country into the United Kingdom in recent years. Yet in recent years Argentina has exported to the United Kingdom more corn than has the United States, so that Argentine corn either in shipment or subject to shipment is a potential factor in fixing the prices of corn at New York as well as at Liverpool.

Further, during the grain-grading hearings recently held before the Agricultural Committee of the House there was a number of large grain dealers, including exporters and importers, present. Testimony by several was given, and all agreed that the importation of Argentine corn into the United States had materially reduced the market price of corn throughout the United States. And no corn dealer was there or could be produced who questioned those statements. I submit the testimony first of George W. Eddy, of the Boston Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. Eddy on page 131 of the hearings answered the question propounded by Congressman HAWLEY:

How would it—

Referring to Argentine corn—

compare in standard with ours? Would it be No. 2, No. 3, No. 4, or what?

Mr. EDDY. As graded in I think it is graded No. 2 yellow.

On page 132 Congressman MOSS submitted the inquiry:

If we had no surplus and if we were importing that, the amount we imported also, in your judgment, fixes the price. Do you mean to say that that fixes the price at interior points?

Mr. EDDY. It has an effect on the interior points indirectly. We get to a point where we can import Argentine corn that begins to come in and supply the seaboard, and that sets the price and stops the price from advancing, and the corn in the West gets the benefit of the nearer points only instead of giving them the whole broad market of the East as well.

Again on page 133:

Mr. MOSS. And of necessity it must be that was as long as you deal with imports and exports?

Mr. EDDY. Yes; but as a big market proposition on imports of Argentine corn you take away one-quarter of the demand of western corn by importations of Argentine corn, and that has a very decided influence on making the market for the corn we have to sell. * * *

And again:

Mr. HAWLEY. Have you had any information with relation to the Argentine corn being affected by the weevil?

Mr. EDDY. The old corn that was sold was somewhat affected with weevil, but the new corn that has been coming in has been very good. All that I have seen has been excellent, beautiful.

Henry Goemann, large grain dealer of Toledo, Ohio, testified in part as follows:

Mr. SLOAN. Yes; but the one controls the other. They control each other reciprocally, do they not; the cash and future markets?

Mr. GOEMANN. Yes. If you have got more cash grain than you need, the cash grain goes down and future grain also goes down. If you have more cash grain than you want, the future grain goes down under hedging sales, because the consumer will not buy.

Now take an illustration to-day. I am out of business on corn in the old channels in which I was trading up to six months ago, for the reason that the pressure of Argentine corn in all the consuming sections, from Florida to Maine, has driven me out. Now all that is taken away from us because the grain is headed here from Argentina, and the consumer realizes that he can buy Argentine corn cheaper than he can buy mine, and he realizes the enormous quantity which he can get, and therefore he buys from hand to mouth, and in his buying from hand to mouth he depresses the price of corn in this country, and in consequence of that competition corn has declined 10 cents a bushel; it has declined in the future market. So the price of cash grain makes the future market to that extent.

Mr. Paddock, of Toledo, large grain dealer, said on page 236 of the hearings:

If it had not been for the importation of Argentine corn, I think the farmers would have realized 10 cents per bushel above the present price of corn on account of its coming.

Grain men generally, with due regard for their business judgment and reputation, will not express a contrary view.

Moreover, our State and Commerce Departments are busy year by year in attempting to open the ports of the world to our corn, and the opening of a port to our corn when accomplished is hailed with great satisfaction and credit is demanded therefor. Because that means the admission of our corn to that new open market gives the shipper opportunity of dividing with the purchaser the amount of the duty theretofore charged. This, of course, means that the local producer meeting with competition must ordinarily suffer a reduction of price.

Mr. RUCKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLOAN. I decline to yield until I have finished this matter. Then, if I have time, I shall be pleased to answer any question which may be asked, if I am able to do so.

Mr. RUCKER. I have something which is right pertinent along that line of thought.

Mr. SLOAN. Undoubtedly. I know the gentleman always has something pertinent to ask and pertinent to explain.

That the importation of approximately 21,000,000 bushels of corn into this country within a year would not disadvantage the corn farmer is specially pleaded by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois. The amount imported is belittled, its effect minimized, its possibilities reduced with all the zeal of a special pleader endeavoring to soften the judge or beguile the jury. The alleged insignificance of the importation reminds me of the indiscreet damsel who, when reproached with the evidence of her weakness and folly, said: "It's not so very bad; it's such a little one." [Applause.]

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, this is a very interesting speech, and I think we ought to have a quorum here.

Mr. SLOAN. I hope the gentleman will withhold that point. I am nearly through with my remarks.

Mr. MADDEN. I make the point of no quorum.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. PAGE of North Carolina). The gentleman makes the point of no quorum. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and three Members, a quorum.

Mr. MADDEN. I ask for tellers, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks for tellers, and the Chair will appoint the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART].

Mr. MANN. Tellers for what?

The CHAIRMAN. To ascertain a quorum. It is unheard of, I think.

Mr. MADDEN. Oh, no.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair counts 103 gentlemen present, and the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN] will proceed. There is a quorum present.

Mr. SLOAN. An amusing feature of Mr. RAINEY's speech was his attempt to show that a large amount of the Argentine corn did not go to the Chicago market. The gentleman from Illinois might as well have proved that none of the corn went to the Rocky Mountains and climbed Pikes Peak. It mattered not where it went, every bushel competed with every other bushel of corn for sale in the United States. [Applause on the Republican side.] The gentleman from Illinois sought to defend the placing of corn on the free list on the ground that high prices are paid for corn in the late spring and summer, when the farmers have disposed of their corn. This is an ill compliment to the farmer's thrift, which throughout the Northwest prompts him to hold a good share of his surplus until season conditions give some hint to his prospect for a new crop. But more important, if the farmers could not and did not calculate clearly about probable market conditions when they have the two large factors—home production and home market—how less able would they be to cope with a world production and loss of home market?

The defense of the gentleman from Illinois against the importations on account of limited amount of corn actually entered is like the Texas youth who, having shot and killed a man, pleaded extenuating circumstances in that he had not used on him his remaining cartridges. [Applause on the Republican side.]

As the surplus water gathers in the great Mississippi it presses outward upon the banks, yet 90 per cent of the water runs within the limits of the main channel. Of that small surplus which passes first bottom and goes beyond the crop line

there is usually not more than 1 per cent of the whole water for the period of the flood. Had the Congressman said to a farmer when but one-half of 1 per cent of the Mississippi flood had run over his crop that he therefore had suffered no damages, he would have received but scant approval and undoubtedly lost a vote. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Twenty-one million bushels is 8 per cent of all the international shipment of corn in all the world, based on 10 years' average. Members will understand the effect of that when we recall that the increase in the shipment of all our manufactured articles under the new tariff law over last year's importations is only 8½ per cent. We are reminded by looking about us of the number of men thrown out of employment, the amount of wages reduced, the number of factories closed or hours reduced, the idle cars, and stagnated business arising out of that tariff change or incident thereto. It will suggest an appreciation of what an importation of 8 per cent of all the exportable corn of the world into America means.

Farmers are entitled to the benefits of a steady home market, so that if crops are short they may have some compensation in steady liberal prices, because in good years and bad their necessities demand constant purchases from other industries. In that way steady markets and prices for home demands are kept up.

The farmers in the years of their failure or famine should not be at the mercy of the competition of the great bumper crops raised beyond the seas. [Applause on the Republican side.] In the end the effect of the present policy will be to discourage home production and leave the consumers at the mercy of the foreign producer and speculator, uncontrolled by the check of our laws.

The much-vaunted foreign market has, under the demonstration of this foreign war, been proving itself the delusion and snare which protectionists have been teaching for generations. This demonstration has made overnight many southern free traders into protectionists. It has made them also would-be builders of cotton factories and zealous advocates of ship subsidies. Even gold Democrats are talking cotton money to relieve them from defaults of foreign cotton markets. They all agree now that busy mills of New England should be preferred to the unreachable markets beyond the seas. This great world war is teaching all not to depend on foreign ships, foreign markets, or foreign free-trade tariff policies. [Applause on the Republican side.]

When the next tariff bill or bills are written, their sponsors, instead of claiming as a virtue any growth of our "industries beyond the seas," will assert, "What America needs that we will produce; what she desires that we will make." We prefer the markets of New York and Chicago to the markets of London and Liverpool. The busy looms of Lowell will be preferred to the whirling spindles of Manchester; the furnaces of Pittsburgh and Birmingham to the imprisoned fire and flame of all Europe. We prefer the American laborer to the toiler of the Continent. And we will protect our farmers against the husbandmen anywhere else on earth. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Corn being the leading cereal and first of our products, we should guard it well, lest coming in contact with the weevily product of Argentina its high station will be reduced. Until last October a moderate tariff kept out the Argentine corn and weevil. When Great Britain more than a century and a third ago was furthering her special revenue as well as other schemes for Americans she brought into the country the Hessian fly, which has been a scourge to our wheat and a burden to our farmers ever since. Again, when foreign thought in more subtle form has control of our revenue policy they are bringing in the Argentine weevil to fret our corn raisers for generations to come. [Applause on the Republican side.]

We should be jealous of King Corn's integrity and primacy. It is the one great cereal planted and grown upon the square. Cultivated in lawful atmosphere, it is a sustaining food for man and beast. When wheat failed, barley was scarce, and rye did not crop, it furnished food for the Nation and was the source of "meal and meat." Reared in outlawry, it liquefies in secrecy into the delectable delight of mountain dew. [Applause.] It is the one important grain grown by the original owners of America.

Its silver plume waved here before the helmet of the Florentine glistened on the Western Continent. Its breastplate of gold preceded the discovery of California nuggets. That gold, combined with alfalfa emerald, makes marbled beef, rainbow bacon, and ruby ham. It has contributed more to northwestern thrift and southern hospitality than any other product of American soil. It is entitled to every protection that the Nation, so

dependent upon it, can give, and that which hath been unjustly taken from it should be righteously restored. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yields back three minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLET] such time as he may wish to use.

[Mr. GILLET addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman on the other side [Mr. BARNHART] use some of his time?

Mr. BARNHART. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KIESS] desired 15 minutes, but he does not seem to be present at this moment. I will yield 10 minutes additional to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD].

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY].

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, owing to my well-known attitude in regard to our merchant marine, and because of the fact that I have been one of the most active men in the United States in urging the restoration of the American flag to the sea, and that the bill passed a few days ago was opposed to what I have always advocated, I have been asked why I did not actively oppose that measure. I do not assume that my attitude upon this bill is of sufficient public importance to justify me in taking up the time of the House even for a few minutes; but feeling that just at this time, in view of the great European war and the duties and responsibilities that it has placed upon this Nation, I might in so doing be able in a measure to do a service to my country, is the explanation why I shall take a few moments in regard to the matter.

I wish, briefly, first to explain the conditions on the Pacific coast, and especially in the Pacific Northwest, as related to this legislation.

When the Underwood tariff bill was pending before Congress we pleaded for protection of the industries of the Northwest. The answer we received was to place practically every one of our products on the free list. The tariff was taken from lumber, shingles, and dairy and farm products. The Underwood tariff law benefited British Columbia; it injured the State of Washington. The Chinaman, the Hindu, and the Japanese were given preference by that law to the American citizen.

That law closed our mills and opened those of British Columbia. More shingles came into the United States from British Columbia during the month of last June than ever came into this country before in any one year, and this amount is constantly increasing. These shingles are produced almost entirely by oriental labor. With free lumber and free shingles, and with the British Columbia manufacturer having the benefit of cheap free ships manned by cheap foreign crews that carry their product to the Atlantic coast markets of this country, the only hope left for the lumber and shingle industry of my State was the advantage given American ships through the Panama Canal. Then this advantage, to placate the demands of the transcontinental railroads and to cover up the blunders in Mexico, was taken from us. This action increased the rate on every thousand feet of lumber sent from the Pacific coast to the Atlantic, either by rail or water, \$1.50, and gave the benefit of that \$1.50 to the manufacturer of British Columbia.

Through a defect in our navigation laws the Pacific Northwest is denied absolutely the protection of the coastwise law between the Atlantic and Pacific ports, an unjust and infamous discrimination against a small portion of our own country. I have tried in vain to have this remedied. But the distinguished leader of the majority frankly told me that he would not permit it to be done in the tariff law, and also stated that he would do all that he could to prevent it being changed by any other method. With that statement the Pacific Northwest is absolutely helpless until the Republican Party shall again come into power. Perhaps under a Republican administration it will be possible to have all laws, whether wise or unwise, apply alike to all parts of our common country.

To-day it is not a question of whether the trade from Puget Sound through the Panama Canal with our Atlantic coast shall be carried in American ships or foreign ships; it will be carried mostly in foreign ships. The only question is, Shall those ships run from Puget Sound or from British Columbia? To illustrate, a foreign ship loads with lumber and shingles at Vancouver. It unloads that cargo at Philadelphia. There it loads with steel and furniture, goes back through the canal and unloads the cargo at Vancouver, British Columbia. That steel and furniture are placed on the cars and sent to Bellingham, Spokane, and other points in the United States without the pay-

ment of a single cent of duty or charges of any kind or character. The cars that carry this cargo into the various portions of the United States are then loaded with lumber or shingles or wheat or other freight, whether this freight be produced in the United States or British Columbia, is taken to Vancouver, and there on a foreign ship it is sent to any American port without being required to pay charges of any kind.

These are the conditions we face at Seattle and on Puget Sound. We are not protected by the laws of our own country as every other section is protected. We do not have the equal rights guaranteed to us under the Constitution. We are discriminated against by law, one of the most infamous forms of tyranny. And this Democratic Congress has steadfastly refused to even consider changing this injustice, and by denying American ships free passage through the Panama Canal they took from us our last defense. This discrimination against this one section of our country is inexcusable and vital to the prosperity of the Pacific Northwest.

Under these circumstances I felt that the people of that section were justified in demanding foreign ships for the trade from coast to coast and that such provision should be incorporated in the bill. I felt that they were justified in making this demand, as the man is justified in taking life in self-defense. What under ordinary circumstances may be a crime then becomes a commendable act. But as the bill was finally passed we were denied on the Pacific coast all relief. As it has happened only too often before, the South and the East were cared for and the Pacific coast was neglected. Then why did I not make vigorous protest against the bill as finally passed? This is my answer:

To-day the greatest war of the world is devastating the earth. The greatest tragedy since men have for love or hate murdered men is now being enacted. Never before was the earth so wet with human blood as it is to-day. The map of the world is being changed. Kingdoms and empires are crumbling. The history of the human race is being written by a giant and bloody hand. Modern civilization is showing its latent savagery. When the end will come nor what the result will be no earthly wisdom can tell.

We think of the white upturned faces of the dead, the anguish and suffering of the wounded and dying, the grief and anguish of widows and orphans, the indescribable suffering and misery, poverty and want that must follow. As we think of all these countless and helpless victims of human greed, ambition, and ignorance the appalling horror of it oppresses and almost stupefies us. We can not but feel that this measureless sacrifice is useless. But let us hope that it will not be in vain.

We know that most of those who go down to cruel death are innocent victims of a power they could not control and of a conflict that they did not desire. The great common people of all the nations involved loved peace, they hated war. There is no same man in all the world to-day but who deprecates this bloody conflict. Ours is the one great nation of the earth not involved. Upon us more than upon any other nation rests the responsibility of keeping in a position of absolute neutrality, not only for our own sake but for the sake of humanity. [Applause.]

Never before in the history of the world has so great a responsibility rested upon a nation as rests upon us now. Never before in the history of the human race has there come such a great opportunity to benefit mankind as comes to us to-day.

What we must do above all things else is to remain neutral, to remain at peace with all, and maintain that peace with honor.

Every true American citizen unreservedly approves the sentiments upon this proposition so beautifully and patriotically expressed by the President and by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN]. The words of these two great men in this trying time should be an inspiration and a guiding star to the American people. [Applause.]

In this awful conflict we pity all; we favor none. That many dangerous conditions will come is almost certain. Men or nations clutching at each other's throats engaged in a death struggle do not stop to reason. They are controlled by the insanity of hate. They do desperate things. We should remember these facts and not be swept from cool judgment by their acts. When such emergency arises, then is the time for self-control, for dispassionate thinking, for careful speaking, on the part of every true American that we may remain at peace, act justly, and discharge faithfully the mighty duty that fate has placed upon us.

This Nation to-day suffers commercially beyond computation, but we should not grow hysterical or resentful. Let us determine that overanxiety on the part of some for the dollar shall not involve us in this conflict. [Applause.] Our commercial

injury is great, but it is as nothing compared with the calamities of war.

Let us be thankful that conditions are no worse, and pray to Him who holds the destiny of nations in the hollow of His hand that we may not become involved in this awful conflict. [Applause.]

It is said that the Democratic Party will profit by this war. It may be so. If it profits by ably and patriotically performing its duty in this hour of our country's need, then all good citizens will rejoice. [Applause.] If it attempts to play politics and tries to save the party instead of the country, then the curse of this people and of generations yet unborn will fall upon it. [Applause.]

In this emergency there should be no party and no politics. My partisanship stops at the boundaries of my own country. Beyond that, when it is this Nation against the rest of the world, then we are all Americans. [Applause.]

While this shipping bill as it has been passed did not meet my judgment, and while I believe it will be disappointing in

its immediate results and disastrous in the end, and while I feared that it might lead us into great danger, I did not actively oppose it; and why? Because the President had asked for this legislation. He believed it wise. He is in a better position to judge of the conditions than anyone else. In this trying hour his responsibilities are the greatest. No one doubts his integrity or his patriotism. And I did not propose by any word or act of mine to do anything, standing as we are in the shadow of this great world war, that could possibly be construed, either at home or abroad, to the effect that the people of this country were not in this mighty emergency, without regard to party or politics, standing as one man back of the President. [Applause.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HUGHES] such time as he may occupy.

Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I submit a few figures and facts relating to finance, commerce, and business conditions:

Receipts and disbursements, United States Government, 1901-1914.

ORDINARY RECEIPTS BY FISCAL YEARS.

Years ending June 30—	Customs.	Internal revenue.	Direct tax.	Miscellaneous sources.		Total ordinary receipts.	Excess of ordinary receipts over ordinary disbursements.
				Premiums on loans and sales of gold coin.	Other miscellaneous items.		
1901.....	\$238,585,456	\$307,180,664	\$38,954,098	\$587,685,338	\$77,717,984
1902.....	254,444,708	271,800,122	36,153,403	562,478,233	91,287,375
1903.....	284,479,582	230,810,124	45,106,968	560,396,674	54,797,667
1904.....	261,274,565	232,904,120	45,538,229	539,716,914	7,479,092
1905.....	261,798,857	234,095,741	48,712,161	544,606,759	18,753,335
1906.....	300,251,878	249,150,213	45,315,851	594,717,942	45,212,517
1907.....	332,233,363	269,666,773	61,225,524	663,125,660	111,420,531
1908.....	286,113,130	251,711,127	63,236,466	601,060,723	20,416,667
1909.....	300,711,834	246,212,644	56,664,912	603,589,490	58,734,955
1910.....	333,683,445	289,933,519	51,894,751	675,511,715	15,806,324
1911.....	314,497,071	322,529,201	64,346,133	701,372,375	4,234,377
1912.....	311,321,672	321,612,200	58,844,593	691,778,465	37,244,502
1913.....	318,891,396	344,416,966	60,822,808	724,111,230	41,340,524
1914 ¹	292,128,528	380,000,000	62,215,173	734,343,701	33,784,452

¹ Preliminary figures.

ORDINARY DISBURSEMENTS BY FISCAL YEARS.

Years ending June 30--	Premium on loans and purchase of bonds, etc.	Other civil and miscellaneous items.	War Department.	Navy Department.	Indians.	Pensions.	Interest on public debt.	Total ordinary disbursements.
1901.....		\$122,282,003	\$144,615,697	\$60,506,978	\$10,896,073	\$139,323,622	\$32,342,979	\$509,667,333
1902.....		113,469,324	112,272,216	67,803,128	10,049,585	138,488,560	29,108,045	471,190,858
1903.....		124,934,305	118,619,520	82,618,034	12,935,108	138,425,646	28,556,349	506,089,022
1904.....		136,602,203	115,035,411	102,056,102	10,438,350	142,559,263	24,646,490	532,237,822
1905.....		143,033,729	122,175,074	117,550,308	14,236,074	141,773,965	24,590,944	563,530,094
1906.....		142,894,472	117,946,692	110,474,264	12,746,859	141,034,562	24,308,576	549,405,425
1907.....		153,045,913	122,576,465	97,128,469	15,163,609	139,309,514	24,481,158	551,705,129
1908.....		175,420,409	137,746,523	118,037,097	14,579,755	153,892,467	21,426,138	621,102,330
1909.....		186,502,150	161,067,462	115,546,011	15,694,618	161,710,367	21,803,835	662,324,445
1910.....		180,076,442	155,911,706	123,173,717	18,504,131	160,696,416	21,342,979	659,705,391
1911.....		173,838,599	160,135,975	119,937,644	20,933,870	157,980,575	21,311,334	654,137,998
1912.....		173,824,989	148,795,422	135,591,956	20,134,840	153,590,456	22,616,300	654,553,963
1913.....		170,529,673	160,387,453	133,262,862	20,306,159	175,085,451	22,849,108	682,770,706
1914 ¹								700,559,248

¹ Preliminary figures.

Foreign commerce.

MERCHANDISE.

Fiscal year.	Imports.	Exports.	Excess of imports.	Excess of exports.
1893.....	\$866,400,922	\$847,665,194	\$18,735,728
1894.....	654,994,622	892,140,572	\$237,145,950
1895.....	731,969,965	807,538,165	75,568,200
1896.....	779,724,674	882,606,938	102,882,264
1897.....	764,730,412	1,050,993,556	286,263,144
1898.....	610,049,654	1,231,482,330	621,432,676
1899.....	697,148,489	1,227,023,302	529,874,813
1900.....	849,941,184	1,394,483,082	544,541,898
1901.....	823,172,165	1,487,764,991	664,592,826
1902.....	903,320,948	1,381,719,401	478,398,453
1903.....	1,025,719,237	1,420,141,679	394,422,442
1904.....	991,087,371	1,460,827,271	469,739,900
1905.....	1,117,513,071	1,518,561,666	401,048,595
1906.....	1,226,562,448	1,743,894,509	517,332,061
1907.....	1,434,421,425	1,880,851,078	446,429,653
1908.....	1,194,341,792	1,800,773,349	606,431,557

Foreign commerce—Continued.

Fiscal year.	Imports.	Exports.	Excess of imports.	Excess of exports.
1909.....	\$1,311,920,224	\$1,663,011,104	\$351,090,880
1910.....	1,556,947,430	1,744,948,720	188,037,290
1911.....	1,527,226,105	2,049,320,199	522,094,094
1912.....	1,653,264,934	2,201,322,403	551,057,475
1913.....	1,813,008,234	2,465,881,149	652,872,915
1914.....	1,891,169,180	2,364,625,555	470,457,375

First six months, 1914.

Excess of exports:	\$49,323,680
January.....	25,875,369
February.....	4,943,930
March.....	11,339,544
Excess of imports:	2,476,896
April.....	653,222
May.....	8,462,233
June.....
July.....

Imports of 1913 and 1914—Continued.
[From Monthly Summary of Commerce and Finance.]

Groups.	Twelve months ending June—			
	1913		1914	
Free of duty:				
Crude materials for use in manufacturing.....	Dollars. 509,725,230	Per ct. 51.62	Dollars. 549,489,594	Per ct. 48.73
Foodstuffs in crude condition, and food animals.....	179,829,039	18.21	201,851,983	17.90
Foodstuffs partly or wholly manufactured.....	10,889,197	1.10	37,069,761	3.29
Manufactures for further use in manufacturing.....	180,580,155	18.29	201,054,183	17.83
Manufactures ready for consumption.....	97,122,111	9.83	127,149,718	11.28
Miscellaneous.....	9,378,430	.95	10,887,460	.97
Total free of duty.....	987,524,162	100.00	1,127,502,699	100.00
Dutiable:				
Crude materials for use in manufacturing.....	125,484,971	15.20	84,565,294	11.03
Foodstuffs in crude condition, and food animals.....	31,917,461	3.87	45,983,522	6.00
Foodstuffs partly or wholly manufactured.....	183,354,023	22.21	190,165,423	24.81
Manufactures for further use in manufacturing.....	168,821,773	20.45	118,660,704	15.48
Manufactures ready for consumption.....	311,056,593	37.68	321,163,230	41.91

Imports of 1913 and 1914.

Groups.	Twelve months ending June—			
	1913		1914	
Dutiable—Continued.				
Miscellaneous.....	Dollars. 4,849,251	Per ct. 0.59	Dollars. 5,884,785	Per ct. 0.77
Total dutiable.....	825,484,072	100.00	766,422,958	100.00
Free and dutiable:				
Crude materials for use in manufacturing.....	635,210,201	35.04	634,054,888	33.48
Foodstuffs in crude condition, and food animals.....	211,746,500	11.68	247,835,505	13.08
Foodstuffs partly or wholly manufactured.....	194,243,220	10.72	227,235,184	12.00
Manufactures for further use in manufacturing.....	319,401,928	19.27	319,714,887	16.88
Manufactures ready for consumption.....	408,178,704	22.51	448,312,948	23.67
Miscellaneous.....	14,227,681	.78	16,772,245	.89
Total imports of merchandise.....	1,813,008,231	100.00	1,893,925,657	100.00
Per cent of free.....		54.47		59.54
Duties collected from customs.....	318,142,344		202,128,528	
Average ad valorem rate:				
On dutiable.....		38.54		38.12
On total imports.....		17.55		15.42

IMPORTS OF FARM PRODUCTS.

Imports into the United States of certain farm products for 9 months ending June 30, 1914, under the tariff law of 1913, together with the imports of the same articles for 9 months ending June 30, 1913, under the tariff law of 1909 and the per cent of increase. Also the imports of the articles for the 9 months under the present tariff law compared with the imports of the same articles under the 1909 tariff law for the full year ending June 30, 1913.

Article.	Total imports for 9 months, October, 1913, to June, 1914, inclusive, under tariff law of 1913.		Total imports for 9 months, October, 1912, to June, 1913, inclusive, under tariff law of 1909.		Per cent of increase or decrease, 9 months under 1913 law, compared with 9 months under 1909 law. ²	Total imports, year ending June 30, 1913, under tariff law of 1909.		Amount of increase in value for 9 months under new law over full year under old law.	Per cent of increase, 9 months over full year. ²	
	Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.		Quantity.	Value.			
Cattle ¹	number.....	725,584	\$16,345,448	366,130	\$5,771,094	98	421,649	\$8,640,668	\$9,704,780	146
Horses ²	do.....	29,911	1,803,930	7,852	1,386,086	280	10,008	2,125,875		
Sheep ¹	do.....	220,809	391,648	13,330	74,127	1,548	15,498	90,021	301,627	335
Animals, other (including live poultry) ³	do.....		584,915		201,027	190		248,950	335,935	131
Bread and biscuits ⁴	do.....		354,244		207,433	69		255,336	98,908	38
Corn ⁵	bushels.....	11,843,166	7,598,702	274,733	160,761	4,210	903,062	491,079	7,107,623	1,444
Oats ⁶	do.....	22,276,137	7,882,733	79,966	37,678	29,145	723,899	289,364	7,593,369	2,627
Wheat ⁷	do.....	1,971,430	1,755,955	472,385	368,846	317	797,528	559,559	1,196,396	213
Hay ⁸	tons.....	143,865	1,410,738	106,026	956,812	35	155,763	1,514,311		
Beef and veal ^{9 10}	pounds.....	176,333,072	15,140,173				4,288,764	322,567	14,817,606	4,593
Mutton and lamb ^{9 10}	do.....	12,690,924	1,112,294				212,843	716,406	1,095,888	6,679
Pork ^{9 10}	do.....	4,594,602	537,946		1,103,949	1,677	261,247	38,682	499,264	1,290
Prepared and preserved meats ^{9 10}	do.....		1,754,888					426,788	1,328,100	311
Bacon and ham ^{9 11}	pounds.....	2,006,960	383,699				628,367	156,933	226,736	144
All other meats ^{9 10}	do.....		693,665					297,581	390,084	133
Sausage and bologna ¹²	pounds.....	553,422	141,235	597,648	133,877	7	728,469	157,871		
Sausage casings ¹²	do.....		2,227,856		1,753,179	27		2,476,082		
Milk and cream, fresh and condensed ¹	do.....		1,880,752		859,030	119		1,203,833	685,919	56
Butter and substitutes ¹³	pounds.....	7,390,147	1,616,408	980,622	258,367	652	1,162,253	304,090	1,342,318	441
Cheese and substitutes ¹⁴	do.....	48,090,810	8,775,541	38,084,797	7,027,405	26	49,387,944	9,185,184		
Eggs ^{1 15}	dozen.....	5,832,725	1,059,593	953,823	143,784	511	1,271,765	191,714	867,879	452
Vegetables:										
Beans ¹⁶	bushels.....	1,416,566	2,504,214	711,511	1,383,695	99	1,048,297	1,938,105	666,109	34
Onions ¹⁷	do.....	810,956	742,291	573,730	361,222	41	789,458	481,756	260,535	54
Pears, dried ¹⁷	do.....	771,023	1,638,709	657,290	1,074,849	17	1,134,346	1,835,775		
Potatoes ¹⁸	do.....	1,652,658	799,554	308,960	279,103	494	327,230	303,214	406,340	163
All other in natural state ¹⁹	do.....		1,374,413		1,172,418	17		1,410,351		
Wool, unmanufactured ^{20 21}	pounds.....	223,146,052	48,730,303	136,169,670	25,040,880	63	193,293,255	35,579,823	13,150,480	36
Total.....			129,280,817		49,853,631	159		69,322,865		88

¹ Free on and after Oct. 3, 1913.

² Duty reduced from \$30 per head where value not over \$150, 25 per cent ad valorem where value over \$150 per head, to 10 per cent ad valorem on all.

³ Live poultry reduced from 3 cents per pound to 1 cent per pound, dead from 5 cents per pound to 2 cents per pound.

⁴ Either placed on the free list or duty reduced about one-half.

⁵ Free on and after Oct. 3, 1913. Duty was 15 cents per bushel.

⁶ Duty reduced from 15 cents per bushel to 6 cents per bushel.

⁷ Free if imported from countries which impose no duties on like imports from United States, otherwise 10 cents per bushel. Duty was 25 cents per bushel.

⁸ Duty reduced from \$4 per ton to \$2 per ton.

⁹ Free on and after Oct. 3, 1913. Duty was 25 per cent ad valorem.

¹⁰ Included in all other meat products prior to July 1, 1913.

¹¹ Free on and after Oct. 3, 1913. Duty was 4 cents per pound.

¹² Free under both laws.

¹³ Duty reduced from 6 cents per pound to 2½ cents per pound.

¹⁴ Duty reduced from 6 cents per pound to ad valorem duty equivalent to about 4 cents per pound.

¹⁵ Included in all other articles prior to Oct. 3, 1913.

¹⁶ Duty reduced from 45 cents per bushel to 25 cents per bushel.

¹⁷ Duty decreased from 40 cents per bushel to 20 cents per bushel.

¹⁸ Free if imported from countries which impose no duties on like imports from United States, otherwise 10 per cent ad valorem. Duty was 25 cents per bushel.

¹⁹ Duty reduced from 25 per cent ad valorem to 15 per cent ad valorem.

²⁰ Practically all free of duty since Dec. 1, 1913.

²¹ Per cent of increase of wool for 7 months under new law over same period of last year under old law, 96 per cent.

²² Per cent of increase figured on quantities, where quantities are given, otherwise on values.

²³ Per cents of increase figured on values.

²⁴ Total value of all meat products, except sausage, bologna, and bologna casings, for 9 months, \$19,672,825; for June, 1914, \$3,896,094, compared with \$125,498 for June, 1913.

²⁵ No figures for months under old law. Quantity and value figured as two-thirds of year.

The period of nine months ending with July 1 showed an increase over the corresponding nine-month period under the old law of 150 per cent. This period is significant in this, that it covers three-fourths of the fiscal year of 1914 and does not include any part of the period influenced by anticipation or actual occurrence of the European war. These figures show not only an enormous increase of farm products, but a progressive one.

	Steel orders.	Unfilled tonnage.
Jan. 31, 1913	7,827,368	7,827,368
Feb. 28, 1913	7,656,714	7,656,714
Mar. 31, 1913	7,468,956	7,468,956
Apr. 30, 1913	6,978,762	6,978,762
May 31, 1913	6,324,322	6,324,322
June 30, 1913	5,807,317	5,807,317
July 31, 1913	5,399,356	5,399,356
Aug. 31, 1913	5,223,468	5,223,468
Sept. 30, 1913	5,003,785	5,003,785
Oct. 31, 1913	4,513,767	4,513,767
Nov. 30, 1913	4,396,347	4,396,347
Dec. 31, 1913	4,282,108	4,282,108
Jan. 31, 1914	4,613,680	4,613,680
Feb. 28, 1914	5,026,440	5,026,440
Mar. 31, 1914	4,653,825	4,653,825
Apr. 30, 1914	4,277,068	4,277,068
May 31, 1914	3,998,160	3,998,160
June 30, 1914	4,032,857	4,032,857
July 31, 1914	4,158,589	4,158,589

It will be seen that the falling off for the first seven months of 1914, as compared with the corresponding months of 1913, is about 35 per cent.

INCREASED IMPORTS OF WOOL AND WOOLENS.

Exports from Bradford to the United States of wool and manufactures of wool, first 5 months, 1914, 1913, 1912, by months.

[Compiled from British Board of Trade Reports.]

Date.	British and colonial wool.	British wool.	Worsted yarns.	Worsted tissues.	Woolen tissues.
	Pounds.	Pounds.	Pounds.	Yards.	Yards.
January, 1914	8,800	2,600	117	4,220	887
January, 1913	2,700	1,900	9	1,406	378
January, 1912	6,700	1,000	1,007	1,007	246
February, 1914	10,800	1,900	123	2,742	699
February, 1913	7,300	600	381	220	220
February, 1912	11,400	1,200	8	634	201
March, 1914	9,900	2,000	159	3,102	600
March, 1913	4,800	800	479	122	122
March, 1912	7,500	2,100	2	897	211
April, 1914	14,600	2,300	172	2,031	464
April, 1913	4,700	500	9	796	116
April, 1912	9,000	2,000	10	323	104
May, 1914	12,500	2,200	284	1,933	548
May, 1913	2,500	400	5	675	109
May, 1912	12,100	1,900	4	532	103
Total Jan. 1 to June 1, 1914	56,600	11,000	846	14,028	3,293
Total Jan. 1 to June 1, 1913	23,100	4,200	24	3,737	885
Total Jan. 1 to June 1, 1912	46,800	8,200	24	3,392	896

The United States consul at Bradford, England, reports that the declared exports to the United States from the Bradford consular district for the six months ended June 30, 1914, amounted to \$17,494,869, the largest total in the history of this consulate, with the single exception of the first six months of 1897—the closing days of the Wilson tariff—when the exports amounted to \$19,115,953.

The shipment of raw wool amounted to \$6,223,271, as compared with \$1,657,397 during the first six months of 1913.

THE TRADE SITUATION AND THE OUTLOOK.

Table showing conditions of trade and future probabilities in all industries, based upon statements made by 2,045 manufacturers.

Industry.	Percentage of replies showing—															
	Improvement in sales, Jan. 1 to June 30, 1914, compared with Jan. 1 to June 30, 1913.				Improvement in collections, Jan. 1 to June 30, 1914, compared with Jan. 1 to June 30, 1913.				Present condition of industry.				Prospects of industry for the current year.			
	None.	Slight.	Fair.	Marked.	None.	Slight.	Fair.	Marked.	Poor.	Fair.	Good.	Excellent.	Poor.	Fair.	Good.	Excellent.
Agricultural implements	Per ct.	Per ct.	Per ct.	Per ct.	Per ct.	Per ct.	Per ct.	Per ct.	Per ct.	Per ct.	Per ct.	Per ct.	Per ct.	Per ct.	Per ct.	Per ct.
Brewing and distilling:	62	13	12	13	58	14	20	8	32	38	22	8	20	43	27	10
(a) Malt liquors	58	19	17	6	68	12	16	4	21	47	18	14	27	38	22	13
(b) Spirituous liquors	73	9	18		50	8	42		59	33	8		44	44	12	

Failures first 6 months. [Dun's Review.]

	Number.	Liabilities.
1911	7,061	\$103,698,334
1912	8,317	108,000,000
1913	8,163	132,909,061
1914	8,334	185,099,730

A comparison of the second quarter—April, May, and June—of 1914 with same period of previous years Dun's Review average liabilities:

1893	\$37,994
1894	13,751
1895	14,370
1896	13,504
1897	15,121
1898	11,381
1899	7,165
1900	17,114
1901	9,943
1902	9,699
1903	13,366
1904	10,949
1905	9,303
1906	11,515
1907	15,173
1908	12,805
1909	14,787
1910	13,678
1911	14,319
1912	12,898
1913	15,135
1914 (largest since 1893; double the average of all years since 1893)	28,874

Building operations. [Dun's Review.]

	1914	1913
January	\$39,436,463	\$44,910,439
February	41,323,571	46,536,158
March	71,812,291	71,962,602
April	71,790,083	83,122,725
May	73,055,238	74,042,482
June	72,740,708	65,972,274
Total	370,128,434	389,536,670

A decrease every month but June.

Bank clearings. [Dun's Review.]

	1914	1913	1912
Average daily:			
First quarter	\$509,039,000	\$518,163,000	\$530,919,000
Second quarter	473,418,000	480,894,000	506,140,000

WHAT THE RECORDS SAY OF BUSINESS FOR THE FIRST HALF OF THE YEAR 1914.

Bank clearings of the United States to June 30, first half of the fiscal year, \$85,477,992,669; a decrease of \$779,666,215.

Railway gross earnings on an average of 218,541 miles for five months ended May 30, \$997,558,018; a decrease of \$57,404,302.

Commercial failures for the first half of the year, 8,244, as against 8,163 in the same period of 1913, involving \$185,099,730, as against \$132,909,061.

Banking failures same period, 93, involving liabilities of \$28,621,312, as against 55 in the same period of 1913, with liabilities of \$6,417,372.

Meanwhile there has been exported \$100,000,000 in gold.

Table showing conditions of trade and future probabilities in all industries, based upon statements made by 2,645 manufacturers—Continued.

Industry.	Percentage of replies showing—															
	Improvement in sales, Jan. 1 to June 30, 1914, compared with Jan. 1 to June 30, 1913.				Improvement in collections, Jan. 1 to June 30, 1914, compared with Jan. 1 to June 30, 1913.				Present condition of industry.				Prospects of industry for the current year.			
	None.	Slight.	Fair.	Marked.	None.	Slight.	Fair.	Marked.	Poor.	Fair.	Good.	Excellent.	Poor.	Fair.	Good.	Excellent.
	Per ct.	Per ct.	Per ct.	Per ct.	Per ct.	Per ct.	Per ct.	Per ct.	Per ct.	Per ct.	Per ct.	Per ct.	Per ct.	Per ct.	Per ct.	Per ct.
Cement clay and products:																
(a) Builders' material.....	62	16	9	13	58	20	17	5	34	41	17	7	45	28	18	9
(b) Cement.....	80	13	7	90	5	5	41	59	47	37	16
(c) Crockery and pottery.....	64	9	18	9	74	17	9	36	44	12	8	30	52	9	9
(d) Paving material, etc.....	50	12	25	13	30	30	10	13	25	50	12	14	14	29	43
Chemicals, oils, acids, etc.:																
(a) Acids.....	53	7	27	13	56	19	19	6	29	35	24	12	31	44	19	6
(b) Paints, varnishes, and dyes.....	58	20	13	8	57	14	27	2	27	46	20	7	25	48	20	7
(c) Soaps and perfumery.....	39	17	33	11	61	11	22	6	12	53	23	12	11	56	22	11
(d) Vegetable and mineral oils.....	40	15	25	20	63	6	31	18	47	35	11	50	28	11
Drugs (finished).....	33	17	22	28	55	17	17	11	18	29	35	18	18	18	35	29
Food products:																
(a) Cereals and by-products.....	28	6	50	16	56	13	22	9	19	25	41	15	13	27	37	23
(b) Food animals and by-products.....	33	20	27	20	60	20	13	7	25	32	18	25	27	33	27	13
(c) Preserved foods.....	40	47	13	31	19	31	19	19	37	25	19	10	30	30	20
(d) Sugar and by-products.....	73	6	18	3	79	3	12	6	31	49	17	3	11	55	30	4
Glass and products:																
(a) Bottles and glassware.....	40	32	16	12	58	15	15	12	27	39	19	15	24	40	20	16
(b) Mirrors, plate, and window.....	87	13	82	12	6	40	53	7	44	44	12
Iron and steel:																
(a) Bridge construction.....	56	28	11	5	65	12	23	27	55	18	48	40	12
(b) Building construction.....	65	19	7	9	78	8	12	2	46	42	8	4	46	33	16	5
(c) Pig iron.....	93	7	77	7	13	3	72	24	4	71	29
(d) Railway.....	83	17	79	8	13	69	10	4	74	26
(e) Steel billets.....	81	12	7	69	12	19	61	23	12	4	73	15	8	4
(f) Unfinished machinery.....	76	10	10	4	78	13	7	2	59	28	9	4	56	36	4	4
Jewelry and silverware:																
(a) Jewelry.....	73	10	14	3	69	10	21	47	37	16	54	30	13	3
(b) Silverware.....	60	10	30	56	22	22	30	40	30	30	40	10	20
Leather and manufactures:																
(a) Automobile and general vehicle.....	64	18	18	45	18	28	9	33	25	17	25	9	46	9	36
(b) Belting.....	89	11	80	20	45	33	22	45	45	10
(c) Boots and shoes.....	46	15	22	17	66	11	23	16	57	16	11	14	63	23
(d) Harness and saddlery.....	43	22	22	13	56	35	9	24	44	32	8	44	48
(e) Leather, raw and tanned.....	66	20	8	6	78	11	8	3	33	53	8	6	22	53	22	3
Lighting and heating:																
(a) Illuminating.....	56	11	28	5	70	18	12	28	50	22	28	48	19	5
(b) Heating.....	74	14	8	4	67	14	14	5	38	36	18	8	19	51	26	4
Lumber and manufactures:																
(a) Boxes, barrels, etc.....	76	12	12	69	10	21	43	37	16	4	36	48	16
(b) Finished furniture.....	70	14	11	5	71	16	8	5	31	44	22	3	24	45	24	7
(c) Lumber for building.....	63	20	10	7	67	16	14	3	36	41	18	5	32	42	20	6
(d) Miscellaneous uses.....	62	15	12	11	70	13	13	4	52	45	16	7	32	42	20	6
Machinery:																
(a) Boilers and engines.....	69	13	9	9	68	17	11	4	38	33	20	9	37	38	16	9
(b) Electrical.....	70	6	3	21	61	13	20	6	39	30	17	14	35	38	12	15
(c) Iron working.....	80	11	5	4	87	6	6	1	54	36	7	3	55	32	9	4
(d) Milling.....	74	18	8	82	5	10	3	38	47	10	5	46	40	11	3
(e) Mining, excavating, etc.....	79	13	8	61	13	26	54	33	13	52	35	9	4
(f) Textile.....	84	4	8	4	74	17	3	6	47	38	14	3	48	35	14	3
(g) Woodworking.....	92	8	80	20	47	37	16	47	47	6
Metals (not iron or steel).....	78	5	12	5	68	11	18	3	39	47	11	3	39	45	11	5
Musical instruments.....	65	2	23	10	57	18	15	10	30	45	15	10	20	40	25	15
Paper and printing:																
(a) Paper boxes and bags.....	62	20	9	9	77	8	15	46	31	20	3	29	51	14	6
(b) Printing, etc.....	69	17	4	10	73	8	15	4	31	45	17	7	31	55	4	10
(c) Paper, miscellaneous.....	67	15	6	12	78	13	5	4	41	40	15	4	39	39	15	7
(d) Printing supplies.....	50	15	35	58	5	37	21	79	16	63	21
Rubber and manufactures.....	50	10	25	15	67	11	22	41	32	18	9	28	33	28	11
Textiles:																
(a) Burlap and cotton bags.....	77	23	77	15	8	25	59	16	15	46	39
(b) Carpets and rugs.....	83	6	11	81	19	45	44	11	53	27	13	7
(c) Cottons and prints.....	73	7	12	8	84	3	11	2	54	32	12	2	50	35	11	4
(d) Finished clothing.....	58	6	18	18	72	13	11	4	38	40	15	7	27	43	21	9
(e) Haberdashery.....	73	17	8	2	76	12	8	4	32	55	11	2	30	49	17	4
(f) Laces and silks.....	54	13	18	15	48	24	14	14	30	47	15	8	21	44	25	10
(g) Woollens.....	77	10	9	4	85	8	7	58	27	12	3	59	19	17	5
(h) Worsteds.....	85	4	7	4	92	8	58	24	10	8	65	19	12	4
Tobacco.....	33	10	24	33	35	15	30	20	5	52	10	33	5	43	19	33
Tools and hardware:																
(a) Bolts, nuts, etc.....	66	6	17	11	53	12	29	6	33	40	16	11	37	38	25
(b) Builders' hardware.....	72	7	7	14	58	21	21	38	38	12	12	20	60	7	13
(c) Mechanics' tools.....	90	3	7	79	13	3	5	48	46	3	3	38	49	10	3
(d) Miscellaneous hardware.....	72	7	10	11	80	8	11	1	26	46	12	6	28	49	16	7
Vehicles:																
(a) Horse-drawn.....	42	19	25	14	46	22	27	5	20	47	25	8	16	32	46	6
(b) Motor.....	28	15	10	47	45	30	5	20	18	45	14	23	4	59	23	23
(c) Vehicle parts.....	63	11	15	11	52	17	27	4	19	54	19	8	17	48	26	9
Miscellaneous.....	74	8	13	5	82	3	10	5	25	44	21	10	25	45	22	8

RAILWAY REVENUES DECREASED.

The net income of the railways of the United States per mile for the year ended June 30, 1914, was the lowest for a decade, according to information compiled by the Bureau of Railway News and Statistics from the monthly reports of the roads to the Interstate Commerce Commission. Operating expenses increased \$35,191,237 and the net operating income, after deducting taxes, decreased \$130,276,210 from the previous year. The bulletin says that, according to the Interstate Commerce Com-

mission's figures, between 1907 and 1913 the average freight receipts of the railways dropped from 7.59 mills per ton-mile to 7.29 mills.

Slason Thompson, director of the bureau, in analyzing the figures, says:

There is no need of searching into the byways and dark passages of railway finance to find out what ails the railways. If they are being "looted"—as runs the favorite phrase of their inquisitors—it is by conditions as inexorable in their results as the laws of nature. Between 1907 and 1913 the average freight receipts of the railways was

hammered down from 7.59 mills per ton-mile to 7.29 mills. These are commission's figures. That reduction of three-tenths of a mill reduced the railway revenues by a round \$90,000,000.

In 1907 the average daily wage of railway employees was \$2.20; last year it was \$2.49. That little increase of over 29 cents a day added over \$160,000,000 to the railway pay roll. Put these two items together and you have a quarter of a billion dollars lost in one year over which the railways have no more control than of the wind which bloweth where it listeth.

RAILWAY EMPLOYEES IDLE.

A most conservative estimate of the railway employees June 1, 1914, made by the Railroad Employer, was from 175,000 to 200,000, and in addition a large number whose working hours were reduced or their income lessened.

IDLE RAILWAY FREIGHT CARS.

On a page of the New York Times of July 12 we find the following:

How the idle cars of this year have compared in number with those a year ago is shown below:

	1914	1913
Jan. 15.....	214,889	28,439
Feb. 1.....	209,678	37,260
Feb. 14.....	197,052	22,183
Mar. 1.....	153,907	31,381
Mar. 14.....	124,865	37,775
Apr. 1.....	139,512	57,988
Apr. 15.....	212,869	57,498
May 1.....	228,879	39,799
May 15.....	238,612	50,294
May 31.....	241,892	50,608
June 15.....	231,334	63,927
July 1.....	219,545	63,704

The enormous disparity between the numbers of freight cars lying idle in 1913 and 1914 amounts to an absolute refutation of the claim that business conditions are sound. When, as on May 31, 1914, the number of idle cars exceeded by 190,000 the number that were idle on the same date in 1913, four months before the Underwood tariff went into operation and when business was at the normal mark of protection prosperity, there was manifestly something wrong with business. That something wrong remained up to July 1, 1914. It still remains, and all the optimistic reports which newspapers can work up will not wipe out that fact.

THE UNEMPLOYED.

For several years preceding the enactment of the Underwood tariff what might be called full employment was given to all our wage earners; in other words, with the exceptions due to illness, worthlessness and strikes, and other rare exceptions which must always exist everywhere in the country, all who wanted work and were worthy of it could obtain it.

Immediately upon the operation of the new tariff, October 3, 1913, conditions began to change, and in a few months it was estimated that from three to five million had been thrown out of employment. It is, of course, difficult to get an exact census of the unemployed, but we can obtain an approximate idea of the situation. For instance, we know that about 200,000 railroad employees are out of work; we know that some 200,000 men usually employed in the lumber industry are now idle; we know that over 200,000 textile operatives have been thrown out of work, and as many more in the iron and steel industry; in fact, it has been stated that over one-half million iron and steel workers and those of kindred industries are idle. Fully 100,000 miners are idle, and many thousands engaged in car making and locomotive shops.

From day to day during the past six months figures have been given showing the closing of shops in every part of the country. First, it would be a thousand thrown out of employment, then a few hundred, until newspapers which have followed the figures assume that some 3,000,000 men are idle. But this by no means tells the whole story. There are thousands and thousands of female wage earners idle in every phase of industry; there have been thousands upon thousands of clerks and clerical employees laid off; there have been thousands of day laborers thrown out of work, and many thousands in the trades, such as carpenters, masons, bricklayers, plumbers, painters, decorators, and so on through the list.

According to a recent census report 35,000,000 people in the country were engaged in gainful occupations in 1910, and that number was largely increased during the following three years. Let us, however, take that as a basis and assume that only 10 per cent have become idle under the new tariff; that would give us 3,500,000; but we know that in many occupations and industries fully one-fifth, or 20 per cent, have been thrown out of employment. If that proportion covered the whole country, it would make 7,000,000 idle. It seems, then, that we may take

a middle ground between the two extremes and safely assume that at least 15 per cent of our people have been thrown out of employment. That means that over 5,000,000 wage earners are idle; and assuming a loss of \$2 a day for each, that would be a loss in wages of \$10,000,000 a day, or at the rate of \$3,000,000,000 a year.

The Underwood tariff seems, then, not only to have been a blunder and a failure, but a crime against the American wage earner.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to my colleague on the committee, Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania.

Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, it is not my intention to enter into an extended discussion of this bill, but to briefly state some of the reasons why, in the judgment of the committee, this bill should be enacted into law, and inasmuch as my time is limited I trust that I may not be interrupted.

At this time when the administration and its leaders in Congress are endeavoring to find some way in which to increase the revenue to meet the current expenses of the Government the consideration of the printing bill now before the House is most opportune. Suggestions have frequently been made upon the floor of this House with regard to the best method for raising additional revenue, but very little has been done toward curtailing the expenditures of the Government. What the country needs most at this time is to cease all unnecessary expenditures, and the practice of more economy in conducting the business of the Government would be appreciated by all the people. The passage of the bill now under consideration will help accomplish this to the extent of nearly \$1,000,000 per year, as is shown by the complete and exhaustive report accompanying the bill. The necessity for more practical business men in our lawmaking bodies is becoming generally recognized, as well as the fact that the successful management of the financial affairs of the Government is purely a business proposition. At this time it would seem in order to call attention to the rapid increase in the expenditures of the Government from \$5 per capita in 1890 to over \$7 per capita in 1910. I desire to insert in the RECORD as a part of my remarks an editorial from the New York Sun of August 12 with reference to the increase of Government expenses.

The editorial referred to is as follows:

Since European war has upset the trade of the world and entangled the finances of the United States the necessity of filling the Treasury has engaged the attention of the authorities at Washington, in the executive departments and the Congress.

They have conversed together about the practicability of new taxes and the feasibility of increasing the imposts now in force.

They have speculated as to the sums that might be brought into the Treasury in this way and that, and they have assured the Nation that, come what may, their ingenuity will be equal to the task of devising means to fill the strong box.

It is an alarming, although not a novel, fact that in all the dissertations on this pressing and important subject not one suggestion has been made that deficit in income should be met, even in part, by economy of expenditure.

There has not been a single recommendation that expenses should be reduced and the outflow of money from the Treasury checked, or that any bureau or department of Government should contribute to the mollification of the present situation by restraining its enterprises, reducing its salary list, or even withholding itself from increased and costly activities.

It is accepted at Washington, and apparently throughout the country, that the extravagances of to-day mark the possible minimum of governmental cost. It is assumed that no bureau, no department, no expert, no clerk can be dispensed with, and that the sole solution of the problem is the collection of more taxes from the people of this country.

How has the taxpayer fared in a generation of American National Government consisting of administrations each of which was elected pledged to the strictest economy, and in two cases on platforms specifically denouncing the wasteful conduct of their predecessors? A few figures tell.

In 1890 the population of continental United States was 62,947,714. The expenditures of the Government were \$318,040,710. The per capita cost in that year was \$5 plus.

In 1900 the population was 75,994,575. The expenditures were \$487,713,791. The per capita tax was \$6.40 plus.

In 1910 the population was 91,972,266. The ordinary expenditures were \$659,705,391. The per capita cost that year was \$7.10 minus.

We were told in 1900 that there had been an extraordinary necessity for greater expenditure consequent on our War with Spain. The per capita increase over 1890 was about \$1.40. In the period between 1900 and 1910 we had no war to add to our burdens and no foreign complications by which to account for a heavier tax. Yet the per capita charge of ordinary expenditures grew between 1900 and 1910 by 70 cents, or one-half the increase of the preceding decade, with its war and the subsequent appearance of the United States as a "world power."

The present Congress, elected to office on the solemn assurance that it would reduce expenditures and safeguard the people's money, has shown in its acts a persistent indifference to its pledges that has called from its sane leaders stinging rebukes on the floor of the House of Representatives. The Executive, engrossed with reformatory projects of a far-reaching nature, has shown no disposition to exercise its power in the cause of economy. To-day the members of the majority in the Congress and the appointed officers of the executive departments concentrate their efforts not on the redemption of their promise of economy, not to save in a financial crisis money to the citizens, but in the devising of new means of extracting money from men tortured by fears of the business future, bled by extravagant State, county, and city ex-

penses, and harassed by the threat of interferences and restraints that will kill their enterprises, baffle initiative, and render labor fruitless.

We commend the present attitude of this Government with respect to its domestic affairs to the earnest study of all the citizens. We believe that study will amply reward those who indulge in it. We conceive that somewhere within the United States there must exist a politician capable of recognizing the straits to which his country is reduced and competent to estimate the dimensions of the public opportunity offered to a man of sense, courage, and real patriotism.

Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania. The need for a revision of the printing laws is apparent when we take into consideration that it has been nearly 20 years since a general revision of these laws has been made, and conditions have very materially changed, so much so that it was deemed necessary to undertake the framing of new laws to meet the present-day requirements. This work was started in the Sixty-first Congress, and in the Sixty-second Congress the Committee on Printing of the House and Senate prepared bills, after careful investigation and hearings had been given to all interested parties. The Senate passed a printing bill during the closing days of the Sixty-second Congress, but it reached the House too late for consideration in that session. While no act was finally passed by the Sixty-second Congress, the data obtained by the committees was of great value in framing the bill now under discussion. During the present Congress the Committee on Printing held numerous hearings and gave the subject careful thought, with the result that the bill now under consideration has many new features. The bill as introduced by the chairman of the committee, Mr. BARNHART, represents the views of the committee, which was unanimous in reporting the bill to the House. I might say that a bill almost identical to this has been introduced and reported in the Senate. Every commission, committee, or expert who has investigated the subject of public printing and binding in recent years has recommended that a complete revision of the printing laws must be made by Congress before the Government Printing Office can be placed upon a proper business basis. It is therefore apparent that the necessity for a revision of the printing laws is an established fact.

In the discussion of this bill the question of the control of the Government Printing Office by Congress has been raised. In the first place I desire to call attention to the fact that under existing laws the control of the Government Printing Office is vested in Congress and has been since its establishment in 1860, and for many years the head of that office was designated as the Congressional Printer, for the reason that the Government Printing Office was established primarily for the work of Congress and only incidentally for other branches of the Government. Congress never relinquished its control over that great office, and I do not believe the time will ever come when it will. It is absolutely necessary that the Government Printing Office be ever responsive to the needs and requirements of this great body. In 1874 the title of the Congressional Printer was changed to that of Public Printer, but it does not appear that this was done with any intention by Congress of relinquishing its control over the Government Printing Office. The Joint Committee on Printing was created by a law of Congress approved August 3, 1846. The joint committee from that date to this has consisted of three Members of the Senate and three Members of the House, who constitute, in fact, a board of directors for the Government Printing Office. The duties of this joint committee have been enlarged from time to time by Congress. Some form of supervision over the Government Printing Office by Congress is essential because of their close relationship. The committee is of the opinion that the Government Printing Office should be entirely under the control of Congress and believes that such supervision can best be exercised through the Joint Committee on Printing. Under existing law it has considerable authority, and the pending bill has been framed with the view of defining that authority.

The matter of Government printing is a very important one, as it involves the expenditure of a large amount of money each year, and the expenses of the Government for printing is of necessity increasing annually. Now, if by the enactment of this bill into law we can increase the efficiency of the Government Printing Office, provide a more economical distribution of public documents, and thus reduce the cost of printing and binding, we will have accomplished a great service. Opposition to any measure that so radically changes the law as is in force now and has been in force for the past 20 years may be expected. At the same time those opposing the measure know that abuses have arisen under the present law that should be corrected. We do not claim perfection for the bill as reported, and it may be that amendments will be proposed by Members of long service in the House whose experience would aid in suggesting wherein the bill could be improved and strengthened, and the committee will welcome such amendments, but, on

the other hand, will oppose unfriendly amendments offered for the purpose of defeating the measure. Legislation, as we know, is a matter of compromise, and the ideal can not always be attained; but we believe that the passage of this bill will be a large step in the right direction. The report accompanying this bill shows the enormous waste in the printing and distribution of Government publications. This is one of the most important features of the bill under discussion, and the committee, after careful investigation, believes that the proposed bill will save the Government nearly a million dollars per year. It would, therefore, seem well worth while to pass this bill and give it a trial, as the present system of distribution of documents should be improved, and we believe this bill will produce the desired result if enacted into law. It is not the intention or purpose to curtail the present publicity, which is vital to good government, but rather to aid such publicity by providing more efficient methods and abolishing useless waste and extravagance.

As stated in the report, the bill has been prepared with the purpose of vesting the necessary control over the Government Printing Office in Congress through the Joint Committee on Printing, while at the same time every effort has been made not to hamper the Public Printer in any way in the proper management of that great establishment. Upon the Public Printer rests the burden for the successful operation of that plant. The committee's only purpose is to safeguard the interest that Congress and the people have in the honest and efficient conduct of that great office.

One of the principal causes for the present waste in public documents is the extravagance in duplicating printed and bound congressional and departmental publications. Another great loss is due to the defective method of distribution. The valuation plan for the distribution of public documents to Members of Congress, as proposed in the bill, will correct this, in a large measure, and give to each Member the documents that will be of most value to his constituents. This valuation plan is, without doubt, the most important part of the bill and will likely meet with considerable opposition from those who do not favor any change from the present method of distribution. During the consideration of the bill I will have something further to say regarding this feature of the bill.

Much time has been spent in the preparation of this measure, and the committee has devoted many months to the most careful consideration of the bill. It has been repeatedly submitted to all branches of the Government interested and has received most favorable commendation from those persons having a knowledge of the defects of the present law and the urgent need for a radical reform in the Government's method of printing and distributing its publications. The printed hearings, reports, and other publications relating to public printing and binding which were studied in the preparation of this bill fill more than 2,000 pages. It can not, therefore, be said that the bill has not received adequate consideration. This bill, if enacted into law, will effect great economy in printing and binding without decreasing the efficiency of the service. [Applause.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 21 minutes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, two weeks ago last Monday the House passed as an emergency measure a bill providing for the registration under the American flag of certain vessels now flying the foreign flag. The bill was somewhat delayed in the Senate, but I believe the conference report was rejected in the Senate and the House bill agreed to in the Senate one week ago yesterday. It was stated to the House when it was presented that it was a matter of very great urgency, and we passed it without any consideration by a committee.

I do not know just when the bill was signed by the President and became a law, but I assume that it was sent to him at least one week ago. We have various other emergency matters that are likely to be presented and urged on the ground that we must act immediately because of a great emergency. Although the ship-registry bill was passed by both Houses more than a week ago, the regulations in accordance with it, to be prescribed by the President, have not been issued. The great emergency was in Congress. Apparently the departments that deal with these great emergencies forget the emergency as soon as we have acted.

We appropriated two and three-quarters million dollars some weeks ago to bring home American citizens abroad. I have no disposition to criticize, but I wonder why we can not get the machinery in motion so as to actually take care of the people?

On the American ship-registry bill I have this telegram from the president of the United States Steel Co. That was one of the companies which we were told had a number of vessels under a foreign flag that was desired to be registered under

the American flag in accordance with the terms of this bill. The telegram reads:

Hon. JAMES R. MANN,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Our steamer *Bantu*, loaded for Uruguay and Argentina, and steamer *Crofton Hall*, loaded for Chile and Peru, in New York Harbor ready to sail. Steamer *Kentra* ready for grain or cotton, Atlantic coast or Gulf. Steamer *Santa Rosalia*, Puget Sound, ready for wheat. Steamers *San Francisco*, *Buena Ventura*, *Ikaria*, *Industry*, *Matoppo*, and several others available for transportation of American products, and we are patiently awaiting issuance of proclamation in order to be in an intelligent position as to whether we can put these steamers under American flag immediately and operate them competitively with steamers in over-sea trade under other flags, as our steamers are being held in various ports at very heavy expense. Would appreciate advices as to about when information will be available to enable us to determine what to do. Capt. Dollar and other American owners of ships now under foreign flags are in the same position. The provisions of law prescribing that the watch officers of vessels of the United States registered for foreign trade shall be citizens of the United States should be suspended for a period of at least three years, and the provisions of law requiring survey, inspection, and measurement by officers of the United States should also be suspended for the same period. Further, until the war-risk insurance bill has passed the House and becomes effective we would be without such insurance in the event of transfer.

JAMES A. FARRELL,
President United States Steel Corporation.

Under the law which was passed by both Houses more than a week ago the President is authorized to make suspensions proposed, and to permit these ships to take out American registry. Although we acted in the House with, I believe, 40 minutes' discussion, these owners of these vessels that are now in port, ready to sail, held for the regulations that are to be made, are, as they say, patiently waiting—I suppose they are watchfully waiting—until some one in connection with the Department of Commerce, the Bureau of Navigation, or the administration can find time out of the great amount of time they have consumed in sending legislation for us to enact to apply that which we have enacted and adopt regulations and let these vessels register and do business. [Applause.]

I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, the bill under consideration provides for a needed codification of the printing laws, and with some modifications and amendments, the wisdom of which have, I think, been clearly indicated, the bill should pass. It is not my purpose, however, to discuss the features of this bill, but to utilize the time which has been allotted to me to point out and call attention to the effect on the wool and sheep industry of the agitation for free wool which went on for a number of years and was consummated in the passage of the Underwood tariff bill.

The Underwood tariff act of October 3, 1913, placed raw wool on the free list, beginning December 1, and considerably reduced the duties on partly manufactured wool and on woolen goods, beginning January 1 following the passage of the bill. It is a well-understood fact that a majority of the Democratic membership of the House of Representatives favored a small duty on wool; in fact, a bill placing a duty of 15 per cent on raw wool had passed the House a few months before the passage of the Underwood bill. It is also well understood that the Democratic majority was forced to accept free wool by the President, in which position it was understood the President was strongly supported by the Secretary of State, Mr. Bryan.

ATTITUDE TOWARD THE WOOL INDUSTRY.

During the discussion of the Underwood tariff bill quite a number of gentlemen on the Democratic side expressed their views as to the effect of free wool. The gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. Peters, called attention to the fact that under free wool the American woolen manufacturers would have an advantage, in that they would be relieved from the necessity of paying duty on their wool. Democrats from the manufacturing districts seemed to base their support of free wool largely on the theory that free wool would benefit the manufacturing industries. Democrats from city districts and large consuming centers based their contention for free wool on the proposition that free wool would make wool and cloth cheaper, and thereby benefit the people of the country other than wool producers.

In none of these speeches made on the Democratic side in support of free wool was there any contention that the farmers would secure as much for their wool under free trade in wool as they would receive under protection. Such a contention would have been ridiculous coming from men who were basing their support of free wool on the theory that wool must be cheaper in order that cloth might be cheaper. For instance, Mr. Dixon, of Indiana, during the course of the debate said:

We intend to reduce the price of woolen goods by taking the tax off all wool, in order to allow our people to buy woolen goods for winter.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR] said:

We want to legislate in the interest of the consumer. I want to give the people of the country cheaper woolen clothing.

And so forth. There was no pretense on the part of anyone supporting free wool that they did not expect free wool to make wool cheaper than it would be under protection.

NOT "LEGITIMATE" FROM DEMOCRATIC VIEWPOINT.

The proposition was to sacrifice the woolgrower on the altar of the public good. There was no claim that he would not sell his wool cheaper under free wool than under protected wool. In fact, after the Underwood bill had passed the House and gone to the Senate and was there being discussed, I had a colloquy with the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] relative to the general effect of the bill if it became a law. I asked him if I had his promise that if any labor or industries were injured under their tariff legislation the injustice would be rectified by legislation, to which he replied that if they found, "after thorough investigation, that an industry, or the labor employed in it, had been injured, you may rest assured that this side of the House will rectify any wrong which has been done." I then asked him if this promise included the wool and sugar industries, to which he replied, "Oh, there are some propositions that we recognize are not entitled to be classed as legitimate industries."

In view of this attitude of the Democratic Party, I was fully justified in making the statement that I did in that debate—that the Democratic Party does not consider the sheep and wool and woolen industry "entitled to any consideration as to its present status or future prospects in the framing of the tariff bill." It is true there were Democratic Members of Congress from woolgrowing States who were fearful of the effect of free wool on their political fortunes. If their solicitude had been for the interest of their sheep growers rather than for their own political interests, they would have been more entitled to consideration at the hands of those engaged in sheep raising and woolgrowing.

REVIEW OF THE SITUATION.

It is, of course, impossible to absolutely demonstrate the ultimate effect of free wool on the wool industry of the United States from less than a year of trial. Much depends upon the effect of reduced duties on American wool and woolen manufactures, for if American mills are closed it is immaterial whether or no there is a duty on wool. Much depends also on the world's supply of wool, as basic prices are fixed by the law of supply and demand. While, therefore, I do not expect to give any final demonstration of the effect of free wool, I do expect to be able to show that every opinion of the students of protection as to the injurious effect of free wool and excessive reduction of the rates of duty on many classes of woolen goods has been verified, and more particularly to demonstrate that none of the claims and prophecies made by those who favored free wool, and heavy cuts in rates on woolen goods, as to benefits to be secured through these tariff changes have been fulfilled.

In order to intelligently discuss the wool situation it is necessary to go back to 1909, when the Payne tariff bill became a law. At that time and for a number of years previous the protective principle seemed securely established and the wool and woolen industries were reasonably normal. Wool prices for that year, therefore, represent normal conditions under protection. The Payne bill became a law August 5, 1909, retaining the same duties on wool which were carried in the Dingley law.

Very soon after the passage of the Payne tariff bill, however, certain influences hostile to various provisions of the act and to the Republican administration united in a fierce attack on Schedule K, the immediate effect of which was to depress the price of American wool through the fear of tariff changes. The Democratic victory of 1912, bringing the certainty of tariff reductions and the probability of free wool, still further depressed wool prices, and when, on May 8, 1913, the Underwood bill passed the House, with wool on the free list, wool went to and even below a free-trade basis. In fact, to all intents and purposes, wool has been on the free list since May 8, 1913.

ADVANCE EFFECT OF TARIFF CHANGES.

The depressing effect of the threat and certainty of free wool, and reduced rates on woolen goods, on wool prices in advance of the actual change of law has been illustrated a number of times in our history. The threat of free wool under Cleveland began its depressing effect on wool prices long before the Wilson bill became a law, and the lowest prices received by American woolgrowers, compared with foreign prices, during the entire period of the Wilson bill depression occurred before the bill became a statute.

History has repeated itself under the Underwood bill, and with scarcely a variation. Up to this time the lowest prices paid in the recent past for American wool, as compared with

foreign prices for similar wool, was after free wool was assured by the passage of the Underwood bill in the House, but before it actually became a law.

It is this fact, coupled with an advance in the world's price of wool in the past year, that gives a few of our Democratic friends the excuse for their noisy assertion that wool has been advanced in price since the passage of the Underwood bill. During the discussion on March 30, 1912, of the Democratic bill of 1912, revising Schedule K, I called attention to the depressing effect of agitation for and threat of free wool in advance of change of tariff rates, as follows:

The wool business is the most peculiar in the world. It is a business with regard to which it is possible in times of tariff agitation and uncertainty to press the price of the domestic clip down almost to a free-trade basis, and I have known of clips—not many, but some—being sold in my country that did not, in my opinion, bring more than 2 or 3 cents above a free-trade basis.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Is not one of the reasons the fact that the rate of interest is so high that very often the sheep raiser can not afford to hold his clip for a favorable market, but must sell it?

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman understands the situation thoroughly. The rate of interest is high. The sheep business is oftentimes carried on to a considerable extent on credit. The buyer refuses to buy in times of agitation, but stands ready to pick up a clip that must be sold at a sacrifice, and under those conditions is able to secure them at times at but little above a free-trade basis.

Unfortunately that low rate is never reflected in the price which the ultimate consumer pays. If it was, the people, as a whole, would benefit by our losses; but I doubt if the American people, as a whole, have benefited by the failure of the western woolgrower, the merino-wool grower, to receive the full amount he was expected to receive from the rate carried in our tariff laws.

I do not mean to say that our protection has always or generally been that low. In my opinion we had been receiving on an average, and when there was not too much agitation an actual protection, of between 7 and 8 cents on the grease pound. Perhaps that is a rather high estimate.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Certainly.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. The price is quite low now, is it not?

Mr. MONDELL. The price is quite low; not as low as it is sometimes and not as high as it ought to be in order to give us anything like the benefit of the present tariff. Our flock masters are offered, I am told, between 16 and 17 cents for the average fleece at this time. Anyone who knows about foreign prices knows that it is not high enough to cover the foreign cost of the same wool, adding the full amount of our duty.

When there is a threat of lower tariff rates on wool, buyers decline to buy except for immediate needs unless they can buy at a price which will not involve a loss if a lower rate goes into effect before the wool is disposed of. When free wool and low rates on wools became certain early in 1913, many American mills closed down or curtailed operations and refused to buy wool except at a price that would save them from loss if free wool and low duties on cloth and clothing went into effect before the goods made from the wool so purchased were disposed of. This natural attitude of buyers who bought to sell again, and of manufacturers who bought to make into cloth, sent the price of wool down to and, in some cases, below a free-trade basis, even before the free-trade law was in effect.

I was asked on the floor of the House some time ago if wool prices were not somewhat higher this year than last, and having in mind my own section of the country, that from which the so-called territorial wools come, I said that prices were somewhat higher. This statement has been seized upon by some Democratic brethren from woolgrowing districts as a final and conclusive admission of the wisdom of Democratic tariff policies. It is significant that no Democrat from a nonmanufacturing or other nonsheep-raising district echoed this sentiment, and even Democrats from sheep-raising districts who have any sense of logic, refrained from attempting to excuse their action in voting for free wool, on the proclaimed theory that it would make wool and clothing cheaper, by the claim that since the time they voted for cheap wool it had grown dearer. It takes a rash Democrat, with a low estimate of the intelligence of his people, to attempt to fool them with that sort of political sleight-of-hand performance.

The fact is the clip of 1913 was to all intents and purposes sold under free wool just as much as the clip of 1914 was; and sold, according to Department of Agriculture figures, on the average at about the same price.

Mr. BOWDLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. In just a moment. Having gone into the matter carefully I have discovered that the condition of higher prices this year than last was a condition largely local to the western country, for the official figures of the Agricultural Department and of the American Wool Manufacturers' Association show that the average price of wool this year and last the country over was approximately the same. Now I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BOWDLE. Does the gentleman mean to tell this House that free trade in wool is intended to guarantee a low price in wool?

Mr. MONDELL. Do I mean to tell the House free trade in wool is intended to guarantee a low price of wool—I do not know just what the gentlemen who voted for free wool intended to guarantee; if they made any kind of a guaranty, they would be greatly troubled just now to make their guaranty good.

Mr. BOWDLE. Is not the gentleman claiming that the Democratic Party has defaulted on that guaranty?

Mr. MONDELL. I should say it has defaulted just as it has on all other guaranties on their tariff bill.

Mr. BOWDLE. Then it is the gentleman's claim free trade is intended to guarantee a low price in wool, is that right?

Mr. MONDELL. Free trade in wool is advocated by certain people on the theory that it helps the manufacturer. Those are the gentlemen who come from manufacturing districts like the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. Peters. Without regard to what the effect is on anybody else it is, I believe, the claim of such gentlemen it does help the manufacturer. If we are to have free wool and a high duty on woolen goods, I guess gentlemen are correct in saying that would help the manufacturer. Other gentlemen want free wool on the theory that it will make clothing cheaper for every one, without regard to the interest of the woolgrower. A lot of Members voted for free wool because the Democratic caucus bound them to. Our contention is that free wool destroys or hampers seriously and reduces the volume of one of the most important industries under the flag, an industry without which no civilized people can live and prosper, and that in so doing it does not make clothing any cheaper and therefore does not help the people generally. [Applause on the Republican side.] And the figures which I propose to give in connection with this brief outline demonstrate those facts, it seems to me, beyond peradventure.

Mr. HELVERING. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. I will.

Mr. HELVERING. The gentleman says it hampers and destroys the particular industry to which he has referred. Does the gentleman have reference in stating that to those gentlemen who went out of the sheep business in his country on his advocacy of the low price of wool after the Underwood tariff went into effect?

Mr. MONDELL. I never advocated a low price for wool. I never advocated and never desired cheaper agricultural products of any kind than the man who produces them can afford to receive and get a fair income. People have continued in the sheep business in my country in the face of these discouraging conditions to a greater extent than in other parts of the Union, but they have suffered severely.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. I yield.

Mr. DOUGHTON. But suppose the price of wool had gone down, as the gentleman from Wyoming confidently expected it would do, would not the price of the manufactured article—that is, the articles manufactured from wool—have gone down?

Mr. MONDELL. I did not confidently expect wool would go below the prices of last year, unless the prices of wool went down the world over, which it did not, but went up. I do not think the prices of clothing would have gone down, even though the price of wool did. The price of wool this year and last, the kind of wool we grow out in my country, was 5 cents a pound less than it was in 1909, a normal year of protection, and yet you can not get anything in the shape of a woolen garment cheaper than you could in 1909, which proves that while there has been a crippling reduction owing to tariff agitation it has not reduced the price of woolen goods.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Will the gentleman please tell us what section of the United States has suffered so severely from the result of the Underwood tariff law in the sheep and wool industry? The gentleman says his section has not, but certain sections have. Please tell us where they are.

Mr. MONDELL. I did not say my section has not. The intermountain region has suffered by reason of this agitation for free wool, and its consummation in the prices that its wool clip brought this year as compared with a normal year under protection certainly not less than \$6,000,000.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Will the gentleman yield further? If it has suffered as a result of the increase is it likely to continue to suffer?

Mr. MONDELL. There has not been an increase since the agitation for free wool began. There has been a steady decrease below the prices of former protective years. Now, if gentlemen will allow me, I will proceed with my discussion.

NORMAL PROTECTION VERSUS THREATENED AND ACTUAL FREE TRADE.

In view of the effect of tariff agitation on wool prices, I propose to go back to the normal protective year of 1909 and some years before for a comparison with prices under the threat of free trade and its practical accomplishment in May, 1913,

and its consumption in December. The figures which I shall quote in the discussion of this matter I shall take from Farmers' Bulletin 575 of the Department of Agriculture or from equally trustworthy sources, and I shall print at the close of my remarks tables containing the figures to which I shall refer and indicating the source from which obtained. The average wholesale price of "Ohio fine" unwashed wool in the Boston market for the five years 1905 to 1909, inclusive, and for the year 1909 was 25½ cents, as given by the Farmers' Bulletin to which I have referred. The same authority gives the average price of the same wool for the following years as follows: 1910, 24 cents; 1911, 20 cents; 1912, 23 cents. The first four months of 1913 the wholesale price of this wool in Boston was about 24 cents, but with the passage through the House of Representatives of the Underwood bill the price dropped to 21 and then to 20 cents, and continued between those figures to the end of 1913. In February of 1914 there was a slight rise in the Boston price of this wool, and from that time on until the end of May it maintained a price of about 22 cents, running as high at one time as 23 cents.

From a study of these official figures it will be seen that the Boston prices of "Ohio fine" wool averaged much higher under protection than it has since the passage by the House of Representatives of the Underwood tariff bill. In 1909 and before, when prices were normal and not depressed by tariff agitation, the price averaged at least 3½ cents higher per pound than since free wool was decreed.

The table from the bulletin to which I have referred does not give quotations of territorial wools—that is, merino and cross-bred wools from the Rocky Mountain and range States—and therefore I take my figures in regard to that class of wool from tables furnished me by the National Association of Wool Manufacturers, whose figures are the most reliable to be obtained anywhere and universally accepted as being trustworthy. From these tables I find that the average price of Territorial staple, fine, and fine medium unwashed wool on the Boston market for 1909 was 26 cents per pound; for 1910, approximately 24 cents a pound; for 1911, 22 cents a pound; for 1912, 23½ cents a pound; for 1913, 21 cents a pound; and for 1914 up to June 30, 21 cents a pound.

From a reading of these figures it is very clear that the Boston price of territorial wools was considerably higher under normal conditions of protection than it has been under the Underwood bill, being 5 cents a pound higher in 1909 than in 1914. The agitation against the wool schedule in 1910, which is well remembered, brought the wholesale price of these wools down 2 cents a pound, and still they averaged 4 cents a pound higher than this year. The continued agitation of 1911 reduced the price somewhat lower, but still a cent higher than this year; and in 1912 the average price was 2½ cents higher than this year. When, however, in May, 1913, it became certain that we were to have free wool, the price dropped from 24 cents to 22 cents and on down to 19½ cents, or an average of 21 cents—the same, according to these tables, as the average price up to the last of June of this year.

These tables would seem to indicate that my affirmative answer on the floor of the House to the inquiry as to whether the price of wool had advanced was not entirely correct, though it pleased the Democrats, who, having voted for cheap wool, are now taking consolation out of the claim that wool is higher. My statement was based on my knowledge of the selling prices of wool in my State of Wyoming and was correct as to the situation there. It will be noted by a reference to the table that the average price of 21 cents for 1913 does not properly measure the price at which the bulk of the clip was sold by the producer, as the wholesale price had dropped to 21 cents in April, and then fell immediately to 20 cents and then to 19½ cents, and the grower of territorial wools did, on the average, get a somewhat higher price this year than last; his clip, however, was generally lighter.

I have given figures based on the Boston price rather than the local price of wools, because, as everyone knows who is at all familiar with the wool market, it is impossible to strike a fair average among the wide ranges of prices paid locally, as that price depends on the distance of the clip from the market, the character of the clip, and many other conditions. The Boston price, while it is always somewhat above the local price, bears the same relation to the local price at all times, so that, while it does not reflect every local rise and fall and variation, it affords the only index of the rise and fall of the commodity as a whole. I have, however, made careful inquiries as to the prices received by the growers for five large representative Wyoming wool clips for the years 1909 to 1914, inclusive, and I find that the prices paid for these clips for the years in question averaged as follows: 1909, 20½ cents; 1910, 19½ cents; 1911, 18½ cents;

1912, 17½ cents; 1913, 13½ cents; 1914, 17½ cents a pound. These figures, it will be seen, reflect the changes of the Boston market.

WHAT THESE FIGURES SHOW.

I propose to discuss briefly what these figures indicate as to the loss to the American woolgrower on account of the agitation for and the final placing of wool on the free list. The markets of the world present no conditions which have warranted American wool being lower at any time since than it averaged in 1909. There is no reason other than tariff agitation and change why he should not have received as much or more than he received that year, for the foreign price has frequently been higher. The only reason or cause for the lower prices since 1909 has been the agitation for and the final passage of a free-wool bill. Free trade in wool actually went into effect in May, 1913, when the Underwood bill passed the House, so far as prices were concerned.

On the basis of the difference in the average prices of "Ohio fine," unwashed, in Boston, in 1909 and 1914, the shrinkage in value of a 328,000,000-pound clip, which was the clip for 1909, is approximately \$13,000,000, but that does not represent the total loss to the wool industry of the country by reason of the constant Democratic agitation for free trade in wool, for that agitation so discouraged the farmers and flockmasters of the country that they reduced their flocks to such an extent that the wool clip of 1914 was but 270,000,000 pounds, or more than 58,000,000 pounds less than the clip of 1909. Assuming as low an average price as 21 cents a pound wholesale, this represents a loss of approximately \$12,000,000 in the value of the wool clip as between the years referred to, or a total loss to the wool industry in 1914, as compared with 1909, of \$25,000,000. If we make this comparison on territorial wools, both as to the wool actually produced in 1914 and as to the shortage between 1909 and 1914, we will have a figure of loss several million dollars greater.

The wools classed as "Ohio fine" and "medium," and produced in the territory of which Ohio is the center, constitute about 25 per cent of the wool product of the United States; therefore the loss to this section of the country in its wool industry in one season of free trade, as compared with an average year under protection, has been about six and a half million dollars, on the basis of a clip equal to that of 1909, or a loss of upwards of \$3,000,000 on the wool actually sold this year. The Territorial wools, so called, produced in the Rocky Mountain and Plains country, comprise approximately half of the wool product of the country. The loss to the wool industry of that region in this year of free trade, as compared with 1909, an average year of protection, has been approximately \$12,000,000, if figured on the basis of the 1909 clip, or more than \$6,000,000 on the basis of the clip actually shorn.

But these comparisons only take into consideration the present year of free trade, as compared with a normal year under protection. If we carry our comparisons further and apply them to the year 1913, when the passage through the House of the Underwood bill in the month of May, carrying a free-wool provision, put us on a free-wool basis and sent the price of "Ohio fine" and Territorial wools to below 20 cents on the Boston market, and correspondingly lower on the farms and ranges, we will discover a loss even greater than that of 1914, for, while the clip was a trifle heavier, the average price was as low, and particularly in the territorial region considerably lower, than in 1914.

LOSS, 1909 TO 1914.

In order, however, to in any wise adequately measure the loss to the sheep growers of the country and the country at large by reason of the Democratic agitation for free wool, and its final consummation in the Underwood bill, we must consider the steady and progressive reduction in the clip and in prices for the entire period from the normal protection year of 1909 to the time when the evils of free trade were fully consummated by the Underwood bill. The total loss in the reduction of the wool clip of the country in the period from 1909 to 1914, as compared with the clip for 1909, amounts to more than 130,000,000 pounds, which at 1909 prices would have brought about \$30,000,000 in Boston; at this year's prices about \$10,000,000. This enormous loss not only fell on the woolgrower in the reduction of the amount of his income, but it was a loss to the entire country, because of the fact that we were compelled to pay foreigners \$25,000,000 to \$30,000,000 which otherwise would have remained in our own country and among our own people scattered over the woolgrowing States. If, now, we figure the actual loss to the wool industry, based on the reduced prices received during this period of agitation for free trade and of actual free trade, as compared with the normal protection year of 1909, we find an average loss of 3½ cents a pound at a most conservative estimate, which, on the total of

1,500,000,000 pounds produced and sold since 1909, amounts to over \$64,000,000.

As these figures are necessarily based on the Boston rather than the local prices, it may be claimed that the totals are higher than the actual loss to the grower, but that contention is not sound as to the difference in prices from year to year, for, as I have already stated, while the Boston price is always higher than the average local price it bears the same relation to the local price approximately at all times. It can therefore be stated conservatively that the actual loss to the woolgrowers of the country on wool alone, owing to free-trade agitation and free trade in fact since 1909, has been in reduced product \$25,000,000 and in reduction in returns for product actually sold \$60,000,000.

These figures, staggering as they are, do not take into consideration any loss to the wool and sheep industry except the loss on wool alone. The loss in numbers and price of sheep has been very great, and when we take into consideration the advancing cost of meat, the loss in sheep is even a greater menace and calamity, if possible, than the loss of wool. In 1909 we had over 42,000,000 sheep other than lambs; in 1914 approximately 34,000,000, a loss of over 8,000,000, or about 20 per cent; thus one of our important sources of meat supply dwindles in face of the hostile attitude of the Democratic Party, and thus the Democratic Party aids in advancing the cost of living while claiming to be laboring for its reduction.

THE PRESENT AND THE FUTURE.

Serious and significant as these figures are, they do not begin to measure the greater losses which a continuation of free trade in wool are certain to bring. The wool free traders are themselves apparently greatly surprised that wool did not go lower than it did this year compared with last year's prices. They had failed to take into consideration the fact that the 1913 clip was also sold under conditions of practical free trade. The Democrats in the woolgrowing regions, underestimating the intelligence of the people, are comparing the prices of these two years in their attempt to excuse free wool on the ground that it does not do any harm. That sort of sophistry will not fool anyone, for even the people who are not interested in the growing of wool will say that there is no reason why the Government should lose \$20,000,000 in revenue in seven months if no one is going to be benefited through lower prices. Democrats from nonwoolgrowing districts who promised cheaper wool and cheaper clothing through free wool are explaining to their constituents that free wool did not make wool cheaper in 1914, because conditions were unusual and abnormal. They tell them that if they will only wait another year the promise of cheaper wool for the manufacturer will come true. This is a Democratic contention which is sound, and which will probably be verified. Conditions this year have been unusual and abnormal: First, because we are comparing wool prices with the prices of last year under virtual free trade; and, second, because the manufacturing conditions have affected the domestic wool market in an unusual way.

I have already explained the conditions under which the wool clip of 1913 was sold. Free trade had been decreed by the Democratic caucus and clinched by the passage of the Underwood bill May 8. The manufacturers knew that the goods they made from the wool then bought would not be sold until free trade in wool was a fact and lower rates on woolen goods provided. They therefore bought on a free-trade basis or not at all. American wools thus purchased were, of course, cheaper than foreign wools of the same grades could be laid down duty paid, and this fact led the manufacturers to make up their samples for the fall and winter of 1913 and the spring and summer of 1914 very largely from American wool. When in the spring of this year the manufacturers who had been buying from hand to mouth came to purchase the 1914 clip to make up goods to fill their orders they naturally competed sharply with each other. Their samples having been made largely of American wools, they could not, to a very large extent, substitute foreign wools, and out of this competition, brought about by these unusual conditions, prices this spring and early summer, particularly of fine wool, were maintained several cents a pound higher than they would ordinarily be under free trade in wool.

This brings us right back to the basic principle of the matter. Free trade in wool under normal conditions does and will make wool cheaper than under protection; that has always been the Democratic contention as well as the Republican contention. If it does not, what reason can be found anywhere or given by anyone outside of an insane asylum for the loss to the Government of millions of revenue? The only difference between the Democratic and the Republican contentions have been with regard to the final cost to those who use woolen goods. We have contended that a reasonable protection on

wool does help the woolgrower, without injuring the user of woolen goods. In a speech which I made in the House of Representatives March 30, 1912, I expressed the opinion, after careful study of market quotations for years, that the duty which has heretofore been carried on wool gave the domestic woolgrower from 5 to 7 cents a pound more for his wool than he would get under free trade, assuming normal conditions. In other words, our wool has under normal conditions of protection been about that much higher than approximately the same class of foreign wool. No one with any reasonable claim to ordinary horse sense will assert that under normal free-trade conditions American wool laid down in Boston will be worth any more than the same grade of foreign wool. If in the future foreign wool shall be high, American wool, even under free trade, will bring a fair price; but if foreign wool is low, American wool will be correspondingly low. On the basis of the present condition of the world's wool trade and markets the Wyoming clips which I have heretofore referred to as bringing an average of 17½ cents a pound this year would have, under normal conditions of protection, brought from 23 to 25 cents a pound; so that the actual loss this year on the wool clip of the State, based on the difference between the prices received and those our flockmasters would have had under normal protective conditions is certainly not less than two and one-half million dollars. And yet Democratic editors and Democratic politicians wonder why those directly and indirectly interested in this great industry do not like the policies of the Democratic Party. Every year of free wool will cause as great a loss as compared with normal conditions under protection.

IF I WERE A FREE TRADER.

If I were a believer in free trade in wool; if I placed the wool industry in the category of industries that were not legitimate, as Mr. UNDERWOOD did in response to my inquiry; if I considered sheep and wool growers "mendicants" and "suppliants for Government favors," as some gentlemen on the Democratic side have called them; if I believed, as the wool free traders claim to, that cheap wool necessarily meant cheap clothes, and therefore the woolgrower should, in the interest of all the people, be left without protection to his industry—if I held these views I believe I would try to have the courage of my convictions and say that we must have free trade in wool whatever the effect on the industry. A few gentlemen on the Democratic side have the courage to do this, but they are very few, for those who feel that way realize that if one advocates action which is intended to reduce the value of the products of a large number of the American people on the theory that it serves the best interest of a larger number of people one is in all fairness bound to prove that the action proposed or taken will or does actually produce benefits that fully compensate for the losses it entails.

Having demonstrated the great losses to those engaged in the wool and sheep industry through the threat and the fact of free trade in wool, the loss to the body of our citizenship by reason of the decline of a great industry, the necessity for sending abroad for what we should produce at home, the reduction of the natural food supply, I now call upon those who favor the policies which produce these results to show how and where, directly or indirectly, anyone has been benefited by the hostile attitude of the Democratic Party to the wool industry and the losses that have come to the industry thereby.

The fact is there have been no benefits in our country through free wool, and if free wool and agitation for it had done no harm it would not be justified, for it has done no good to the people at large, and it is wicked to even put a great industry in jeopardy when the people generally are not helped thereby.

FREE WOOL, TAXED GOAT HAIR.

Before I proceed to demonstrate that the people generally have not been helped by free wool, but large numbers of them besides the woolgrowers injured, I desire for a moment to call attention to the striking difference in the attitude of the Democratic Party toward sheep and wool and some other industries. This Democratic Congress does not all come from the South. Quite a sprinkling of its Members come from free-trade districts in great importing cities like New York, districts composed very largely of people who are handlers and consumers and not producers of articles. But the southern contingent has the important places on committees; they are a majority of the Democratic majority and they control in all things. Wool is not produced in the South to any considerable extent. Goats are raised in Texas. Wool is on the free list; goat hair is protected. The South has no interest in wool, but the South grows rice, and rice is heavily protected, though it really needs no protection, and wool, which does need protection, is on the free list.

WOOL VERSUS COTTON.

The South grows cotton. It is one of our greatest products for export and consumption. It is entitled to every reasonable consideration, and always received it from the Republican Party. But while the Democratic Party as now controlled in Congress has outlawed wool they find it hard to do enough for their great staple. Hundreds of thousands of dollars of the people's money is spent each year to check the ravages of the boll weevil. Legislation is secured for expensive regulation of grades and samples of cotton and for the regulation of dealing in cotton. Vast sums are spent for cotton seed to be distributed by southern Congressmen. Now it is proposed to issue Government notes against cotton in warehouses in order to enable the cotton producer to hold his product indefinitely, in the hope of getting a higher price for it from the consumer. If there ever was a more striking example of prejudice on the one hand and favoritism on the other than this, I do not recall it.

A wool producer is a "mendicant" if he wants fair treatment; a cotton grower is a coddled favorite. A woolgrower is not entitled to any consideration, they say, and his product must be cheapened; but a cotton grower has every encouragement in getting the highest possible price for his product. The cotton-growing industry and region gets all sorts of favors from a Democratic Congress. It required almost superhuman effort to get an appropriation of \$10,000 for the importation of some sheep from Australia which, it is hoped, will aid a little in the struggle to keep the industry alive under free trade.

WHO HAS BENEFITED?

I turn now to the consideration of the question of who has benefited by the agitation for and the consummation of free trade in wool. Have the people been getting cheaper woolen cloth, clothing, and goods by reason of free wool? That inquiry would seem to be foreclosed by the claim of Democrats from wool-producing districts that wool has advanced in price since it went on the free list. If that is so, and so far as it is so, it, of course, precludes the possibility of cheaper clothing. In fact, if wool has gone up under free trade, as some claim—and we invoked free trade to make wool and clothing cheaper—what have we accomplished?

Under normal conditions wool is bound to be cheaper, compared with foreign wool, under free trade than under protection. He who advocates free trade in wool and still insists that wool prices will not be reduced as compared with foreign prices simply makes himself ridiculous, for if free trade does not cheapen to the consumer why have free trade and lose the revenue? If it does cheapen to the consumer, of course the producer loses. The trouble with the Democratic editors and politicians in woolgrowing sections is that they want to stand in with and defend their party, which is for free trade, in order to get cheap wool and at the same time with the woolgrower, who does not want cheap wool.

I have taken the trouble to make some careful inquiries. I have even attended some "bargain" sales to learn if the average of prices of woolen goods have been lowered. I find, as everyone else has found, that they have not, but that people are paying substantially the same prices for woolen goods that they paid before the passage of the Underwood bill. In fact, I find the prices of some fancy woolen goods have advanced, and I have been told of cases in which foreign woolen goods, which have been imported in large quantities at the reduced rate of duty fixed by the Underwood bill, have, by reason of their being attractive to the trade, been sold at considerably higher prices than similar values bought a year ago or than American goods of higher manufacturing cost are bringing now.

NO REDUCTION IN LIVING COST.

There has been no reduction in the cost of living, so far as woolen goods are concerned, under the Underwood bill, as there has not been in other lines. Sugar is higher, boots and shoes are higher, leather and harness are higher; automobile tires and golf balls are the only articles that went down, and now automobile tires have gone up again higher than ever. I do not use golf balls, so I do not know about them. If there is to be any reduction in the cost of woolen goods by reason of free trade in wool, it should have come long since, for the threat of free trade in wool sent domestic wool last year—that is, the season of 1913—to a free-trade basis and below, as I have heretofore stated. That being the case the American woolen goods of last winter, as well as of this summer, so far as they were made of domestic wool, were made out of wool bought as cheaply or more cheaply than the same wools are selling for now. Therefore our free-trade friends can not reasonably claim that cheaper goods are coming later as a result of their tariff legislation. Their cheap goods are already long overdue.

THE EFFECT ON LABOR.

How about the effect on labor of free wool and its accompanying lower rates on woolen goods? These lower woolen rates were, with free wool, to make goods cheaper; they have not done so. How has the change affected labor? The wage rates on farms and ranches, so far as they have been affected at all, have been lowered. In fact, no one has heard of any wage rate anywhere that has been increased by the Underwood tariff bill.

In the woolen mills and factories labor has been having a hard time to secure steady employment. A considerable portion of the woolen machinery of the country is idle, and unless the European war shall greatly change the situation many more mills will be idle, owing to the continually increased flood of imports. Already the increased importation of woolen goods represents a loss of employment to labor of not less than four or five million dollars.

LOSS OF REVENUE.

The Democratic leaders are searching about for some means of securing additional revenue, they say, to make up for the lack of importations due to the European war; in fact, to head off a deficit which has been long foreseen and which I prophesied on this floor several months ago would have to be provided for. This situation in which the party in power finds itself emphasizes the amount of revenue the Government has lost by reason of the placing of wool on the free list. Wool went to the free list on December 1, and up to July 1, on a total importation of 207,827,282 pounds of wool, we have lost a revenue of \$19,405,901.67, which would have been collected under the Payne bill. Here is an importation of wool in seven months in an amount nearly equal to three-quarters of our domestic clip displacing home-grown wool and bringing no revenue to the Government when it is so badly in need of it.

WESTERN WOOL FREE, EASTERN MANUFACTURERS PROTECTED.

Democratic editors and politicians in woolgrowing States, not having the courage to denounce the action of their party as now controlled in sacrificing a great industry in their region, would have us think that free trade is a good thing for wool and in line with the general party policy. If free trade in the products of woolgrowing regions is good policy, why is it not good policy in manufacturing sections? The Republican tariff rate on class 1 and class 2 wool amounted on an ad valorem basis to about 34 per cent. The Underwood bill placed wool on the free list, but placed duties averaging 35 per cent on woolen goods and as high as 50 per cent on some. Manufacturing industries need protection, but how can Democrats in woolgrowing States defend high tariff rates on the products of the eastern manufacturer while approving free trade for the products of their own people? Nothing but thick-and-thin partisanship, which places party success above the prosperity and happiness of our own neighbors, can approve such an attitude.

THE EFFECT IN BRIEF.

The Democratic Party, while adhering to a haphazard, hit-or-miss, and wholly illogical protective policy in spots and places and in regard to certain favored products and sections, has declared war on the wool industry and placed all its products on the free list.

The result of this Democratic free-wool agitation since 1909 and its actual consummation in 1913 has been—

To reduce the number of sheep in the United States more than 8,000,000—a value of over \$32,000,000;

To reduce the wool clip of the United States more than 130,000,000 pounds, or over \$30,000,000;

To reduce the income of growers of "Ohio" wool more than \$6,000,000 on the 1914 free-trade clip and prices as compared with the 1909 protection clip and prices;

To reduce the income of Territorial woolgrowers more than \$12,000,000 on the 1914 clip and prices under free trade as compared with the 1909 clip and prices under protection;

To reduce the income of the wool producers of the country during this period of agitation and consummation of free trade at least \$85,000,000;

To reduce the income of the Nation on loss of revenues on imported wool in seven months nearly \$20,000,000; and

To deprive textile workers of at least \$5,000,000 of wages on account of increased importations of woolen goods.

Does anyone know of any good which has been accomplished by or through these losses? I will yield to any Democrat who knows of anyone on our side of the Atlantic who has been benefited. I know of no such. I could, however, fill the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with accounts—all before the present war—of foreign mills and factories running overtime to supply goods for the American market, while 30 to 35 per cent of our wool manufacturing machinery stands idle. How long will the American people tolerate a policy which produces such results? Not for long, in my opinion. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Imports of unmanufactured wool into the United States by classes and months during the 7 months' period ending June 30, 1914.

[National Association of Wool Manufacturers.]
Territorial staple, fine and fine medium, uncashed.

Cents.

January	1914.	19.5
February		20.5
March		21
April		21.5
May		22
June		22.2

[Farmers' Bulletin 575, Department of Agriculture.]
Ohio fine, unwashed.

Year.	Low.	High
1905.....	23	30
1906.....	24	28
1907.....	25	28
1908.....	19	27
1909.....	23	28
1910.....	20	28
1911.....	18	22
1912.....	21	25
1913.		
January.....	24	24
February.....	24	24
March.....	23	24
April.....	21	23
May.....	20	21
June.....	20	21
July.....	20	21
August.....	20	21
September.....	20	21
October.....	20	21
November.....	20	21
December.....	20	21
1914.		
January.....	20	21
February.....	21½	22
March.....	22	22
April.....	22	22
May.....	22	23

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, so far as the committee on the House side is concerned, it is really appointed, as the committee understands it, and on the Senate side it is neither chosen nor appointed, but designated.

Mr. MANN. But the Committee on Printing of the House, of course, is elected by the House under the existing rules, and this section requires that out of that committee, which consists of only three members, the committee shall designate three members to go on the Joint Committee on Printing. This is the language:

That there shall be a Joint Committee on Printing, consisting of three members of the Committee on Printing of the Senate and three members of the Committee on Printing of the House of Representatives, to be designated by the Committee on Printing of the Senate and by the Committee on Printing of the House of Representatives, respectively.

Mr. BARNHART. But does not the gentleman from Illinois concede that it might be possible that it could be the duty of a committee to designate, and after this committee was designated, it would be chosen?

Mr. MANN. I have no objection to the use of the word "designated." But you provide that the three Members of the House shall be designated by the House Committee on Printing. And when you use that term in that way it seems to me that is the term you ought to use in paragraph 2—namely, "designated."

Mr. BARNHART. That might be if the methods of choosing in both the House and the Senate were the same, but that does not necessarily follow. We elect our committee here; that is, our membership on the Joint Committee on Printing. On the Senate side there are 9 of the Senate Committee on Printing. We have 3 and the Senate has 9, and from that 9 they choose 3. In the House we designate these 3, and we do not elect them at all, because by virtue of their being on the Printing Committee they become members of the joint committee.

Mr. MANN. You do not elect them at all. Under the terms of the law, which I presume are never complied with technically—this is the existing law—you designate three members of the House Committee on Printing as members of the Joint Committee on Printing. Of course, as there are three members of the House committee you go without any designation at all.

Mr. BARNHART. The gentleman will observe on page 2 it is said they are chosen "as provided herein."

Mr. MANN. As provided in this section.

Mr. BARNHART. As provided previously, as a matter of course.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for a minute more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. Why not, to make it just as clear or clearer and avoid any question as to the meaning of the word "chosen," and not changing the meaning of the word as it is in the Constitution, say "until their successors are designated as provided for in this section"?

Mr. BARNHART. I would not have any objection, but I do not see that it is material.

Mr. MANN. I do not say that it is material, and yet where we have certain words used in the Constitution of the United States with a fixed meaning, and there is no occasion for changing that meaning, I think it is wisest in legislation to take the meaning in the Constitution of those words and retain them.

Mr. BARNHART. I am perfectly willing when we come to paragraph 2 in section 1 that we shall take that matter up. But I think the word "designated" should be left in the opening chapter of the bill.

Mr. MANN. I do not see anything against that at all, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. BARNHART. And when we come to paragraph 2 in section 1, if it is thought best to change the word "chosen" to "designated," I do not believe the committee would have any material objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 1. PAR. 2. The members of the Joint Committee on Printing who are reelected to the succeeding Congress shall continue as members of said committee until their successors are chosen as provided for in this section: *Provided*, That the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives shall, on the last day of a Congress, appoint Members of their respective Houses who have been elected to the succeeding Congress to fill the vacancies then about to occur on said committee, and such appointments shall continue until their successors are chosen as provided for herein. The Joint Committee on Printing as constituted by this section shall exercise all the powers and duties devolving upon said committee under the law, and it may authorize one or more of its members to exercise such of its functions as necessity shall require when Congress is not in session.

Mr. BARNHART and Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART] is recognized.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that, in line 8, the word "chosen" shall be stricken out and the word "designated" substituted therefor.

Mr. MANN. Also in line 2.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 2, strike out the word "chosen" and insert in lieu thereof the word "designated."

Page 2, line 8, strike out the word "chosen" and insert in lieu thereof the word "designated."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words for the purpose of asking unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a speech made by my colleague and my good friend, Mr. ALLAN B. WALSH, of New Jersey, on July 4, at Basking Ridge, Somerset County, N. J., the subject being the Declaration of Independence.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KINKEAD] asks unanimous consent that he may extend his remarks in the RECORD by inserting a speech of his colleague, Mr. WALSH, delivered on the 4th of last July. Is there objection? There was no objection.

The address is as follows:

ADDRESS OF HON. ALLAN B. WALSH, OF NEW JERSEY, ON JULY 4, AT BASKING RIDGE, SOMERSET COUNTY, N. J.

"I consider it one of the very best signs of our times, ladies and gentlemen, that the people all over the country are taking a genuine interest in the same celebration of the Fourth of July.

"It has practically ceased to be a day of noisy boastfulness and somewhat rowdy enthusiasm and is fast coming to be what it ought to be—a day for the manifestation of intelligent and enthusiastic patriotism. It is most fitting that our celebrations take into account the education of the rising generation. The purpose of the day's observance should be made plain to them in every possible way, so that even the youngest may grasp the meaning of it and develop a more patriotic spirit through its yearly observance. Not all the day should be given over to mere jollification. Some little time at least should be set apart for historic consideration, through which we may arrive at a better understanding of the declaration which forms the very beginning of our history as a nation. This will serve largely to keep us in touch with it, and we must remember that it is a mighty important document, not only for us who pride ourselves on our American citizenship but also for the whole world.

"When we pause to consider the purpose of our celebration to-day our minds most naturally travel back to that other 4th of July, 138 years ago, when we had the courage and audacity to get up on our own feet and proclaim ourselves an independent people, fully capable of taking care of ourselves, fully determined to tolerate no longer the oppressive conditions to which we had been reduced by England, and ready to prove our determination, if need be, by force of arms. Well, we had to prove it, and we succeeded in doing so, and it is a matter of history of which we can be justly proud that we not only have stayed on our own feet ever since, but have in the short space of 138 years advanced to the very forefront of the nations of the earth in power, in population, and in prosperity, as well as in that ardent love of liberty and manhood which inspired the great declaration of our independence. And, please God, we shall continue to occupy this proud position.

"Only those who are deep students of the history that has been made since the Declaration of Independence on July 4, 1776, can give you any adequate idea of the influence it has had on the history of the whole world, even to the present day. It is a document that should be read and pondered over by every genuine American citizen, for it concerns us all; and we of the present day, just as truly as our fathers in the past, reap the benefits of its proclamation to the world. While it is true that the Nation has not always lived up to the full content of the document, still it must be admitted that the spirit of the declaration was always there, always understood, and always animating the people in their struggle toward better government. Not only that, but its spirit was breathed abroad upon the peoples of the earth and the eyes of all the oppressed of the world turned longingly toward the new Nation as to a refuge—a blessed land, where every man, no matter how humbly born, might stretch himself up to the full height of his manhood, where the man born in the log cabin might one day be the occupant of the White House.

"We are rather prone to believe that the Declaration of Independence was a statement of conditions already existing in the American Colonies. It was very far from being that, however. As a matter of fact, it was a challenge and a protest against oppressive conditions which existed under the British rule. It was, I might say, a platform or a promise of better

conditions to be realized, if possible, under an independent government, which recognizes the inherent dignity of man and proclaims all free and equal before the law with a right to a voice in the government. And it was our brave proclamation of these principles to the world as the foundations on which we were to build as a Nation that has made this 'the day we celebrate' beyond all others in our national calendar.

"It seems to be a fact of history that in times of great human need great men arise; and the bitter struggle for our liberty as a Nation which followed fast on our Declaration of Independence brought into prominence one of the greatest men of all time whose name will ever be associated with the day. In the history of the world there have been many wise men, many great statesmen, many great soldiers and great philanthropists, but I doubt if you can find anyone among them all who measures up so thoroughly to all the conditions of greatness as our own George Washington. 'First in war, first in peace, and first in the hearts of his countrymen,' is a eulogy, simple but expressive, which can be spoken of him as it can be spoken of no other man, for his whole life was an embodiment of the principles of the great Declaration of Independence. Now, the examples of the lives of great men have an abiding influence on the lives of subsequent generations, and when all the details of the life of any great man are edifying it becomes our duty to keep the memory of that life perpetually green among us so that as citizens we may be influenced by it.

"As a Nation we have not forgotten Washington. We have enshrined his name forever in the great, growing, and beautiful city which is the Capital of our country and the seat of our National Government. But the very best way of all to give him the honor he deserves is for each of us individually to model our activities as citizens upon his.

"Before we had rounded out the first century of our history as a Nation we were plunged into that dreadful catastrophe, the Civil War, which threatened national disruption. Here again, in the time of pressing need, a great man stood revealed—a man who was the genuine product of democracy, a man tender of heart and sympathetic without weakness, who guided the Nation through the dark days of peril with such success that 'no star from our flag was lost' and the principle of national unity was established forever. I believe, ladies and gentlemen, that Abraham Lincoln will live in the history of our Nation and of the world as one of the greatest of men, and his speech at Gettysburg will remain as a classic in the English language—a simple, short, but ringing restatement of the principles of the Declaration of Independence.

"And now, after 138 years, how do we stand to-day in the light of the words of that declaration?

"To-day, ladies and gentlemen, more than ever before do we hold the essential equality of men before the law; to-day more than ever before do we recognize that certain inalienable rights belong alike to the highest and the lowest citizens of the land; to-day more than ever before it is a part of our gospel and of our practice that nothing can be more sacred than the life, liberty, and happiness of the people as a whole; and to-day more than ever before is the truth being driven home in all corners of the world that Governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed.

"Embodied for the first time in its distinct modern form in our Government of the United States, this idea has gone clear around the world, stirring up the oppressed everywhere to demand an audible voice in the affairs of government, the actual establishment of a Republic among the 400,000,000 inhabitants of China being the very latest manifestation of its influence.

"We have had grave problems to face during our short history as a Nation, and in these, our own days, they developed to such an acute degree that we seemed really on the verge of some catastrophe. Indeed, it did look for a time as if we had slipped back to conditions resembling those against which the Declaration of Independence was a protest. The rumblings of dissatisfaction were becoming more and more widespread in the land, when behold here again in our hour of national need a leader appeared whose true greatness grows more evident to the Nation every day. More, perhaps, than anyone ever before, he has stirred up the conscience of the people, pointed out clearly to them the real dangers which threatened the country, and roused them to a sense of their own responsibility for the very existence of those dangers. His utterances have brought us back to sane, sound common sense, and no man with the red blood of an American citizen in his veins can listen to that voice and yet stand idly by and tolerate any going back to the un-American conditions of the immediate past. For my own self, ladies and gentlemen, I cherish daily stronger sentiments of gratitude toward those of my fellow citizens who by their confidence in me conferred on me the distinguished honor of

serving in Congress under a leader who has raised statesmanship to such a high level and who has made us all realize that we are in Washington for the sole purpose of laboring for the best interests of the people, and that in doing this our own interests and personal conveniences are to be considered as of secondary importance. You yourselves, from your knowledge of current events, are fully aware that President Wilson is the very first to set the example of self-sacrifice in this matter for the sake of working out without delay the much-needed reforms to which our party had pledged itself.

"We have grown used to the ways of the political quacks and the newspaper editors who, perhaps, have other interests to serve than purely patriotic ones. We can afford to watch with some amusement while they hurl at our distinguished President their darts of criticism; and whatever our political creed may be we can not help but admire the strength and calmness with which he goes on his appointed way, impervious alike to applause as to clamor and ridicule, determined at any cost to carry out his purpose of making America a good place to be in for all. Great men have occupied the presidential chair, but I believe none of them has realized more fully in himself or lived more completely up to the obligations of American citizenship than our present distinguished President; and I believe, further, that none has been to any more complete extent a President of the people and for the people.

"His Mexican policy has been exposed to almost constant ridicule; even Members of Congress stamp their feet in indignation and hurl forth the hot shot of denunciation against the Mexican policy of the administration, but I am among those who believe Woodrow Wilson is right; that his 'watchful waiting' policy will eventually win and that in the end a crowning victory will be marked to his credit, and I thank God that he has the courage and the patience in the teeth of bitter criticism to withhold intervention with arms in that troubled country. We are too far removed from the terrible days of the Civil War to realize to any great extent the horrors of that war or the curse of war in any shape or form, but it is providential that we have a man at the helm who realizes it and who is determined to save you from it if that can possibly be done without compromising the Nation's prestige or sacrificing her honor.

"Ah, gentlemen, when I think of the millions of our loyal, patriotic, and peace-loving American citizens, who are just about to begin to reap the benefits of improved conditions in this country, and then look forward into a future which would follow for them close upon the heels of war, I hope and pray with all the powers of my heart and soul that the great God of peace will strengthen the hand of Woodrow Wilson by enabling him to work out the solution of this problem by peaceful means without dragging our people through the depths of the hell of war; for if he can succeed in doing this with honor, exercising the patience of conscious strength, President Wilson will have placed our country in an enviable position among the nations of the earth, will have given a new and a powerful impulse to the cause of universal peace, will have enshrined himself in the hearts of the American people, and 'generations yet to come will call him blessed,' while the calamity howlings and criticisms, denunciations, and jingoisms of the present time will have sunk into the insignificance of the chattering of magpies."

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. PAR. 1. The Joint Committee on Printing shall have power to adopt and employ such measures as in its discretion may be deemed necessary to remedy any neglect, delay, duplication, or waste in the execution of the public printing and binding and the distribution of Government publications.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. MANN. I do not now recall whether this is substantially the provision of the existing law or whether this is a new authority to be conferred on the Joint Committee on Printing. It seems to me a very broad authority to give to any committee "to adopt and employ such measures as in its discretion may be deemed necessary to remedy" almost anything. They could override, under the terms of this section, any provision of the law. This provision is not a provision that they may adopt and employ such measures as are not inconsistent with the terms of this act, but they may adopt and employ such measures as in its discretion may be deemed necessary. In other words, the fiat of the Joint Committee on Printing can do anything, on the ground that they give—and it is wholly within their power and discretion—that will "remedy any neglect, delay, duplication, or waste in the execution of the public printing and binding and the distribution of Government publications."

The Joint Committee on Printing, as I am informed and believe, is of the opinion that there is a great waste in the dis-

tribution of Government publications; that Members of Congress have more publications to distribute than they ought to have; that a large share of the publications which are distributed by Members of Congress go into the wastebasket. Having that opinion, under the terms of paragraph 1 of section 2 the Joint Committee on Printing may reduce the number to be issued, although the law provides otherwise, and may direct the suspension of any distribution, and do anything else that it wants to do.

Of course, the present Joint Committee on Printing, with the assistance of the able gentleman from Indiana, in charge of the bill, would not do anything that was improper; but you can not always tell who may be on the Committee on Printing in the course of time.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART] moves to strike out the last two words.

Mr. BARNHART. The only change in this paragraph, Mr. Chairman, from existing law is the addition of the words "duplication and waste." The law has never been abused by any Joint Printing Committee, and probably never will be. The fact of the matter is the Printing Committee is largely subject to the will of the House, and it is the same with the Senate Committee on Printing, which is largely subject to the will of the Senate. But the importance of this feature of the bill consists in the fact that many departments of the Government are continually indulging in duplication of publications. I might show numerous instances of that duplication, but I will use only a few. For instance, we have the "Sanitary survey of the schools of Orange County, Va." That is published by the United States Bureau of Education. We have a publication practically the same, by the United States Public Health Service, on rural schools, "Sanitary survey of schools in Bartholomew County, Ind.," probably made by the same individual. In the Department of Commerce we have issued a publication called "Canned salmon cheaper than meat, and why." Then we have an extract from the Yearbook of the Department of Agriculture on supplementing our meat supply with fish—canned salmon. We have the United States Department of Agriculture issuing Bulletin No. 118, entitled "The school garden." The Bureau of Education publishes practically a duplicate of this and calls it "Cultivating the school grounds of Wake County, N. C." The Department of Agriculture issues a bulletin entitled "How to prevent typhoid fever." The Public Health Service issues a bulletin entitled "Causation and prevention of typhoid fever." Here again we have the United States Department of Public Health issuing a document entitled "Sanitary survey of schools in Bartholomew County, Ind."

Here are three departments issuing practically the same publications. Nobody is especially responsible for this duplication of work; but the committee believes that the law as it stands is working well, and this additional strengthening by the insertion of these words will enable the committee to designate some competent authority or compel the heads of the departments to submit their wants in the matter of publication of public documents to some authoritative head, at least to some authority whereby there may be a compilation which will prevent the possibility of each and every department publishing whatever they choose.

Further, Mr. Chairman, some time ago the Public Health Service printed a bulletin on "The care of the baby." The Census Bureau might have published that if it had the statistics or the suggestions. I understand the Children's Bureau asked for an appropriation to publish practically a duplication of this work. This would surely be a waste, because each of these departments doubtless will ask in its estimates for a sufficient number to supply the demand in that respect and too many would be published by the duplication.

I trust, Mr. Chairman, that this section may be allowed to stand as it is. It is only a slight change from the original. It will give the committee the authority, as is augmented further on in the bill, to prevent the possibility of these duplications, which do amount to a great waste.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the motion of the gentleman from Indiana.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. MANN. I think the gentleman from Indiana is mistaken if he thinks that this provision would give the Joint Committee on Printing any practical jurisdiction over the question whether the Public Health Service should publish a document and the Children's Bureau should publish precisely the same thing. The Joint Committee on Printing will not know anything about it until after it is published. They do not publish unlimited num-

bers. They have a very limited quota, which they live up to; and so far as I am concerned, if the Public Health Service and the Labor Bureau shall publish advice, each of them, as to how to avoid typhoid fever, I am in favor of having it published by them and 40 other bureaus of the Government and put into the hands of the people. But, as I say, they publish very limited numbers.

Now, the gentleman is again slightly in error as to what this paragraph does. It has two additions from the existing law. The existing law gives to the Joint Committee on Printing power to adopt any measures necessary to remedy any neglect or delay in the printing and binding of documents or in the public printing and binding. That is to give them the power to remedy neglect and delay only as to public printing and binding. But this paragraph adds to their power the subject of duplication or waste and adds also "and the distribution of Government publications." Under the terms of the existing law the Joint Committee on Printing has no power to cut down the quota of Members of Congress of publications where the number is fixed by the law.

But under the terms of this paragraph the Joint Committee on Printing, if in their discretion they think it will be a waste to distribute public documents, have the authority to cease to give them to Members of Congress for distribution, and knowing the sentiment of many members of the Joint Committee on Printing in the past that Members ought not to have a large share of the documents which they obtain, I doubt the propriety or the desirability of submitting even to so amiable and excellent and able a gentleman as the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART] the question whether Members of Congress shall have these public documents which they are now authorized to distribute, or whether my friend from Indiana shall cut us out.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Printing have found that there is a great waste in public printing, but that is not because Members of Congress are getting more documents than they are entitled to, but because documents are being printed that the Members of Congress do not draw out, because they have no use for them. For instance, we are printing at great expense not only carloads but a trainload of costly documents every year that are going absolutely to waste, being sold as old junk, and the object of this bill and of the Committee on Printing is not to give Members of Congress fewer documents, but to give them the documents they want and that their constituents have use for, and to prevent the assignment to them of documents they have no use for. For instance, there is placed to my credit in the folding room every now and then a report on spirit leveling in California. That document is of absolutely no use to any person in my district, and we propose to save money by not publishing documents that are of no use to the Members, and to give the Members the advantage of taking in their stead documents that are needed in their districts.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Chairman, is not the abuse to which the gentleman refers taken care of in a subsequent section of this bill?

Mr. TAVENNER. Yes; but that is the general thought all the way through the bill. Now, as to this particular paragraph, we find, for instance, in the Agricultural Yearbook every year the annual report of the Secretary of Agriculture. That report is being printed in four or five different forms. It does not add to the attractiveness of the Agricultural Yearbook, but, on the contrary, detracts from it. The Joint Committee on Printing would like to have the authority to prevent this duplication and to take out of the Agricultural Yearbook that dry, long report which takes up one-third of the book. Those who desire the annual report of the Secretary of Agriculture can get it as such. This simply gives the committee the authority to cut out of that Agricultural Yearbook the duplication of the annual report of the Secretary, so as to make the book more attractive and valuable to the farmer, and to save the Government a large sum of money annually.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Debate on this section is exhausted.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. I move to strike out the last three words. I am inclined to agree with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] in opposing this section. It seems to me that in its present form it confers broad legislative powers on this Joint Committee on Printing, powers that the joint committee ought not to possess. It is true that the committee is a most excellent one. I have the highest regard for the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Printing, and believe much that he said concerning the necessity for economy has been well said, but I think no committee of this House ought to possess the broad legislative powers that this section would confer.

It is suggested that the Joint Committee on Printing might curtail the departments in the issuance of documents. I would not like to see the committee clothed with such power that it could clash directly with one of the executive departments of this Government. I would prefer that the Committee on Appropriations should have the right, as it now has, to supervise the estimates that come in, and recommend to this House the appropriations that are to be made, out of which come the expenditures for printing the documents issued by the departments. Why should this Joint Committee on Printing or the House Committee on Printing have broader, greater legislative powers than any other committee of this House is possessed of? Every other committee of this House is compelled to come here and submit to the action of the House. Every other committee of the House must come here to have its reports confirmed or rejected. But now it is proposed by this section that this Joint Committee on Printing shall be vested with such legislative powers as will permit them to act without regard to what the majority of this House may desire.

Mr. BARNHART. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. With a great deal of pleasure.

Mr. BARNHART. Does the gentleman from New York understand how the Joint Committee on Printing is created and what its duties are under the law?

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. I have some idea, of course.

Mr. BARNHART. I will be glad to have the gentleman state how the joint committee is created and what its duties are under the law.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. I do not know that it makes much difference how it is created.

Mr. BARNHART. Oh, but it does.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Or what its duties are under the law. I do know that it is a committee of the Congress. I do know that it is composed of Members of the Senate and House, and know that Congress should be supreme in the exercise of its right and discretion to regulate the appropriations for the departments. I also know that this section is so broadly drawn that the time will come when the Joint Committee on Printing may clash with executive departments of the Government and when documents required for the use of Members of the House may not be furnished because the Joint Committee on Printing think differently from the departments, either as to the necessity of printing them at all or as to the number required for distribution.

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask my friend from New York if he is content to leave this matter in the hands of the Committee on Printing? I have heard my friend from New York [Mr. GOLDFOGLE] on many occasions say that he regards this committee as one of the best and most efficient of the working committees in the House.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. I have said that before.

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. Yes; and repeated it; and is it not fair now to leave that committee some discretionary power?

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. We are legislating not only for this Congress but for future time; and, while I repeat that I have the highest regard and the greatest respect for this Joint Committee on Printing, the time may come when this section may produce the effect to which I have before alluded, especially if there be a change in the personnel of the committee.

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. Will my friend yield for a further question?

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. There is absolutely no difference of opinion between the gentleman from New York and myself. Both of us are agreed on that subject. Both of us realize that this committee has done its best in the preparation of this measure, and only this morning—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from New York be extended five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from New York be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I think the gentleman from New York ought to be allowed to speak for 35 minutes. He has not had much opportunity to address the House lately. I think he should be allowed to speak until he completes his remarks. He has been a most valuable Member of this body.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York may continue for five minutes more. Is there objection?

Mr. DONOVAN. Reserving the right to object, I wish to amend that request and ask that the gentleman from New York may be allowed to address the House until he finishes, on account of the lack of opportunity that he has had to address the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Connecticut asks that the gentleman from New York may proceed to the conclusion of his remarks. Is there objection?

Mr. BARNHART. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York may proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. DONOVAN. I object.

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to address the House on this matter for three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey asks unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, when my good friend from Connecticut [Mr. DONOVAN] interrupted, I was about to ask my friend from New York [Mr. GOLDFOGLE] if in view of the repeated declarations that he has made—and, I think, conservatively and wisely made—that the Printing Committee, so ably presided over by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART], has not only done its work well but has done it efficiently, intelligently, and ably; that in a matter requiring discretion of the committee, instead of being criticized for bringing in this section of the bill, covering so completely the matter, that it should be complimented and not criticized.

I now say to the gentleman from Indiana that I compliment him and the members of his committee on this matter, and I hope this afternoon when I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the measure that I have introduced and referred to his committee—namely, the printing of the memorial exercises on the Barry Monument—they will use that wide and wise discretion that they have always used and will allow me to have this bill taken up after his measure is disposed of. I have no desire at this time to put the gentleman from Indiana on record in regard to the measure; but after it is read to the House and explained intelligently, as I do everything [laughter and applause], I am sure that no Member on this side of the House, and certainly none of my good friends on the other side, will interfere with a measure that is for the public good.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes in an explanation of some of the abuses that have crept in and which were the cause of drafting this measure.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, section 2, paragraph 1, is really more fully set out on page 122 of the bill in section 81, but I wish especially to call attention of the House at this particular time to some suggestions of my friend from New York [Mr. GOLDFOGLE] because it will be necessary sooner or later that you understand some of the things that have been happening in years past which certainly necessitate the importance of there being some guide and staying hand over the Public Printing Office with which Congress has very largely to do.

The Government Printing Office is the servant of the Congress. It is really ours to have and to hold. It does, most of the time, congressional printing, and we ought to have the right, and always have had for a half century, to govern and control the Government printing.

The fact of the matter is that about the year 1905 some very grave abuses were discovered in the Government Printing Office, and a commission was appointed to make investigation. When that commission commenced the investigation the resignations and reappointments in the Government Printing Office head were so rapid that we had four different Government Printers in one year. Now I will tell you why. If you look into the report you will find, for instance, that during the four and a half years prior to the joint committee's beginning of the investigation Public Printers had expended a total of \$2,303,703.30 for machinery and improvement of the printing plant. Of this sum \$1,621,423.15 was expended for machinery alone, which the Public Printer purchased without being accountable to any one.

This expenditure for machinery was occasioned partly for the installation of typesetting machines. The commission discovered that in the purchase of these machines employees of

the Government had relatives who owned stock in the companies from which machines were purchased, and the Public Printer bought typesetting machines to such an extent that even to this day there are some 50 machines in the Government Printing Office, at an original expense to the Government of \$50,000, that have scarcely been used and are now so obsolete that they never will be used.

Mr. REED. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes.

Mr. REED. Was that under the present administration?

Mr. BARNHART. No. I may say that since about the year 1908 or 1910, since the Joint Committee on Printing became actively engaged in this investigation, the Government Printing Office has been administered quite economically, so far as the Printing Office itself is concerned; but the same law that enabled the former Government Printers, either mistakenly or intentionally, to indulge in this extravagance is on the statute book to-day, and it is that law that this bill seeks to correct.

Another Public Printer decided to change the furniture in the composing room. That is where the type is set. Any newspaper man will admit that it is a workshop. That composing room had substantial white-oak furniture, and the Government Printer, on his own volition, not accountable to anybody, threw the oak furniture away and purchased mahogany, brass-finish furniture instead at an expense of \$20,000 to the Government. And there are many more items of extravagance like that. Another Public Printer installed what he called an auditing system. He did it of his own volition; he was not accountable to anybody, but he spent on that auditing system \$138,110 in less than two years; and when it was discovered that his auditing system was of no account, the Government Printer resigned and the auditing system was thrown out, with a loss to the Government of something like \$140,000 on the scheme.

Had the joint committee or some other board of overseers been authorized to exercise any control over the Government Printer, or had he been required to report to any committee or board of directors, these extravagances would not have been indulged in. Gentlemen of the committee, this joint committee is nothing more than a board of directors for the Government Printing Office.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes, sir; briefly.

Mr. HOWARD. In the last clause of section 2 I notice that it gives the right to the Joint Committee on Printing of being practically a board of censorship of our public documents.

Mr. BARNHART. In the last clause of paragraph 1?

Mr. HOWARD. Paragraph 1, on page 2, section 2. Is it the intention of the Joint Committee on Printing to pass on Government publications in the sense of a censorship, to see whether or not there is a duplication? For instance, take the poultry industry. A public bulletin on the poultry industry in the North has been issued, and there is a public bulletin on the poultry industry in the South. There are two separate conditions under which poultry is raised. Would the gentleman say that because a bulletin has been published on poultry conditions in the North you could not publish another one on poultry conditions in the South?

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, I am very glad the gentleman has asked me that question, and I thank him for it. It is one of the important features of the bill. If the gentleman had read the bill more thoroughly, he would have discovered that further on the bill provides that each department of the Government must each year make a report of its publications. It will then be the duty of the joint committee, or of its clerk, to look through these reports and see if there are any duplications, and suggest to these departments from time to time the duplications that have been made. Thus they will understand that they must report to somebody what is published, and it is probable that thereafter when one department presumes to assume the prerogative of another it will first make inquiry. For instance, the Children's Bureau may undertake to publish a bulletin on the public health. Before doing so I take it that that bureau would, if this provision be enacted, call up the other department and see if that department has a publication of similar nature. The Joint Committee on Printing, under the provisions of the bill as it has been drawn, is nothing more than the board of directors or trustees which we have in every bank in the United States, in every corporation, in every county organization where you have a county council, and in every township corporation where estimates of executive officials must be made to boards of investigation for approval. The gentleman from New York, in his suggestion that this committee had undertaken to legislate, is wrong. It does not undertake to do anything of the kind. It simply undertakes to act in the capacity of insisting that the Government departments and the

Government Printer must have some head to which all these matters can be referred and adjusted.

Mr. GOULDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes.

Mr. GOULDEN. I have discovered, according to your statements, that there has been considerable waste of money, or, to put it mildly, a great extravagance in the Government Printing Office under former administrations. Will the gentleman inform us how the Printer secured this money at the time, and from whom?

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, the money is appropriated by the Committee on Appropriations for the Government Printing Office.

Mr. GOULDEN. Does not the Committee on Appropriations look into these matters pretty carefully?

Mr. BARNHART. I might say that sometimes it does and sometimes it does not. For instance, within the not very distant past, as I said to the gentleman's colleague in the discussion the other day, the House, with approval of the Appropriations Committee, increased wages of certain Printing Office employees over others of similar union wage scales, to the dissatisfaction of the latter, as would be the result from a standpoint of fairness. The wages of this particular class of men were increased and many others doing a class of work for which like wages are paid all over the country did not get the increase. We believe that it is important that some committee of competent authority, or some legislative enactment, shall be provided that would relieve the Committee on Appropriations from haphazard wage-scale making in the Government Printing Office.

Mr. GOULDEN. I agree with the gentleman thoroughly and am in accord with the bill; but as I understood the gentleman, he stated that there was a yearly loss of some \$50,000 on some machinery which was standing idle in the Government Printing Office. To what does the gentleman allude?

Mr. BARNHART. Oh, no; not yearly.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. GOULDEN. If there is any explanation of that, I would like to have it, as this is an interesting matter.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman be extended for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOWARD. The question that I desire to ask my friend from Indiana is this: This gives wider scope of authority to the Joint Committee on Printing over the administration of the Government Printing Office. The gentleman spoke about these men that had their wages increased. Does it not necessarily follow that if this authority is given to the Joint Committee on Printing it will give them practically the power, if they so desire to use it, to act as a censor of who will get the promotions in the Public Printing Office? In fact, would it not be the "whole cheese" down there?

Mr. BARNHART. Far from it. On the other hand, the bill means the very reverse. The bill gives no authority to the Joint Committee on Printing to do anything of the sort. It fixes a scale of wages that at this time seems to be proper, and that is all it does, and it asks for Congress to pass upon that just the same as it would pass on it if any other committee brought it to the floor of the House.

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes.

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I am afraid that I must apologize to my good friend from New York [Mr. GOLDFOGLE]. In reading this paragraph more closely I find that his contention is absolutely correct, and that my statement was wrong, and I want to correct whatever impression I made with regard to it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee whether he or the Public Printer is better qualified to make the rate of wages for the men who are employed in the Government Printing Office. The present Public Printer has been a practical workman employed on the Hudson Observer in the city of Hoboken—

Mr. BARNHART. In what capacity?

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. As foreman. He started in as call boy, and by perseverance, hard work, industry, sobriety, and intelligence he worked himself up until he became foreman of that magnificent plant, and if there is any man in America who is capable of saying what rate of wages shall be paid not only to the pressmen, not only to the feeders, but to every man or woman in the Printing Office, it is that good son of Hudson County, Hon. Cornelius Ford, and I hope that the gentleman from Indiana, using that wise discretion on which I compli-

mented him this afternoon, will allow the House to speedily vote to strike out of the bill this paragraph which mars it, and in sitting down I want to say again to my good friend from New York [Mr. GOLDFOGLE] that his contention was right, and that in answering his contention I was wrong.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, I will answer the interrogatory. I assume that the gentleman from New Jersey has had some sudden information from the outside. I am sorry that this matter comes to a point where it is necessary for me to make some response now that I did not care to indulge in. The present Public Printer has made probably the best showing in economy of any Public Printer the Government has had for many years. He is an industrious, capable man, but he has urged a certain scale of wages in which he reached the climax by asking that his own wages be increased \$2,500 a year.

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. Will the gentleman permit me to say—

Mr. BARNHART. I can not yield further.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. BARNHART. No; I will not yield, but—

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. That is not so, Mr. Chairman; the gentleman in wrong about that. He asked \$500 a year.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey is out of order.

Mr. BARNHART. I do not care to have my authority questioned, and if the gentleman will look at the hearings—

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. That is where it is taken from—

Mr. BARNHART. The gentleman will find he asked for \$7,500 a year, and we give him an increase of \$500, making \$8,000. He has \$5,500 a year now.

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. He asked for how much?

Mr. BARNHART. Seventy-five hundred dollars a year.

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. If he is receiving \$5,500, that is only an increase of \$2,000.

Mr. BARNHART. If I said \$2,500, I meant \$2,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Indiana be extended for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Indiana be extended five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, I might say the committee has appreciated the fact that there is going to be opposition to this bill from one given source, and that is from the Government Printing Office. All Government Printers who have preceded insist that they ought to have the largest authority possible; that they ought to have full control. I want to say to you, gentlemen, that the Government Printer is the only head in any department of the Government who has an expenditure of more than \$2,000,000 in his own care and keeping. We believe it is too much authority, notwithstanding the fact I believe we do have now one of the best Government Printers the Government has ever had. As I said before, I believe he is honest, competent, energetic, and is making a wonderful showing in economy; but that is not any reason why some other Government Printer in time to come might not make the mistakes that have been made heretofore. At the present time the joint committee is proceeding in harmony with the Government Printer in the matter of purchases, and so forth; but the law as proposed will fix it so that it will be necessary for any succeeding Printer, whoever he may be, whether competent or incompetent, to submit his proposed proceedings in purchases to some authority which I have previously alluded to as being virtually a board of directors.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARNHART. I will.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. This has occurred to me, and I would like to be enlightened by the distinguished chairman of the committee. Suppose between the final adjournment of Congress and the convening of the next Congress one of the departments of the Government sees fit on the request of Senators or Representatives or some citizens to issue a particular document. Now, how will the Joint Committee on Printing, under the section of this bill as now framed, act? The Joint Committee on Printing will have no meeting in all probability. They will be away from Washington, just like any other Representatives and Senators will be. Now, then will come the clash and there will be no way of regulating or settling it. The document may be required. It may be of the highest importance that the document shall be reprinted and issued without much delay.

There may be an honest difference of opinion between the department and the chairman of the committee, if indeed the chairman be communicated with. Now, how is that to be settled during the period to which I have referred, namely, between the final adjournment of Congress and the convening of the next Congress?

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, I tried to explain that to the gentleman from New York before, and I take it that he was not listening to what I said, because I explained it in this way: This provision of the bill, or this section, does not fix any authority for the joint committee to say what shall or shall not be done, but the bill further on provides there shall be a report of the heads of departments each year on publications issued, and that the Joint Committee on Printing will take these reports and ascertain whether there has been duplication.

And if there has been to such an extent that it has been wasteful, of course the joint committee will report to some higher authority and try to arrange that the same thing will not occur again. It is suggestive rather than directory.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. I understand all that; but I am afraid I have not made myself clear to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART]. I am referring to the action of the department ordering the reprinting of some document, some bulletin, or some other paper, usually issued from the department. Now, suppose the question arises as to whether or not that is an undue duplication, or whether or not it constitutes waste, as has already been suggested by the gentleman from Indiana. How is it to be settled? The committee will not be here in Washington to act on the matter or settle the matter in difference.

Mr. BARNHART. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Certainly.

Mr. BARNHART. That is merely presumption, Mr. Chairman. For several years there has been no adjournment of Congress; and since the Congress in its wisdom has increased its membership to nearly 440 Members, the probability is that we shall be here year after year practically all the time.

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. The gentleman knows we will have no special session next fall.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I understood the gentleman a while ago to say that the Public Printer has asked for an increase of \$2,000 a year in his salary?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes, sir.

Mr. LINTHICUM. He now receives \$5,500?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I thought you were going to make some statement as to how much increase he recommended for the employees. Do you know whether he recommended that much or how much he recommended?

Mr. BARNHART. I think he recommended a total for employees of about \$87,000.

Mr. LINTHICUM. About what percentage would that be of increase for employees?

Mr. BARNHART. I can not tell.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART] has again expired.

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words.

Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the committee states the Public Printer asked for an increase in his salary from \$5,500 a year to \$7,500 a year, and I find from a copy of the Senate hearings, which I have here, that he did ask for such increase. Whatever little success I have had in life, Mr. Chairman, has come from the fact that I am mostly willing to believe the other fellow.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. I always yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MADDEN. I suppose the gentleman referred to is a very high class man and he is worth all that he asks, is he not?

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. Of course the gentleman from Illinois states exactly the truth. Any first-class printer who comes to Washington from the county that I have the honor to represent in part and takes upon himself the manifold duties incumbent upon the office of Public Printer of the United States, and who asks the modest sum of \$7,500 is, in my judgment to be complimented, and if I were a member of the Printing Committee I would do myself the honor, and I would do the man at the head of that magnificent plant the justice, to vote that his salary be increased to \$7,500. [Applause.]

But aside from that, Mr. Chairman, the all-important fact that confronts this House this afternoon relating to this section is that the present Public Printer of the United States, despite the fact that we have been in session a greater number of days than any other session of Congress since the establishment of

the Government Printing Office, has reduced the running expenses of that plant in round figures \$52,000 a year. And I want to submit to the membership of this House—

Mr. TAVENNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. Not now. I will be glad to do so before I finish if I have the time.

I want to submit to the membership of this House that any man who has intelligence enough, who has industry enough, to save this Government in one year \$1,000 for every week that his plant has been running, ought to have an increase in his salary of \$2,000 a year, and we ought to vote for it as a unit, even though it amounts to 36 per cent, as my mathematical friend from Maryland [Mr. LINTHICUM] indicated.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. Not at the present time.

Now, there is a great deal of misunderstanding regarding the gentleman who occupies the position of Public Printer at this time. I remember that some of our newspapers criticized him during the holiday season because, forsooth, he gave Democrats a place or two in his office. Now, I want to ask my good friend from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], who is square on every proposition that comes before this House, what he would do if he was a Public Printer and had opportunity to place a Republican? He would do as my friend Ford did. If I were Public Printer what would I do if a Democratic Member asked me to try to take care of a friend? Why, I would take care of him. And if a Republican came down that I liked, I would try to help him, too.

Mr. BUTLER. Would you take care of mine?

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. Yes; I would—always.

Mr. Chairman, another thing I want to draw the attention of the House to this afternoon is this: That in these days of economical administration of affairs there is only one way to arrive at economy in the public service, and that is to have men at the head of your institutions in whom you can repose every confidence.

I am not going to vote here this afternoon, simply because in the future some man of a different type than Ford may be Public Printer, and he may say he wants some increases that are not warranted by facts. Let the future take care of itself. Let us say to the people of this Nation that this House, both Democratic and Republican, reposes the utmost confidence in that valiant little man who has wrought a saving of \$1,000 a week despite the 25 per cent increase in the work of his office.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Reserving the right to object, I would like to know if the gentleman will yield part of that time to answer a question?

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. If you will get five minutes for me, I will.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. BARNHART. Reserving the right to object, as this section we are now on has not anything to do with the question of wages, I am going to ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph close at the end of five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART] asks unanimous consent that the debate on this paragraph close at the end of five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. LINTHICUM. I object, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland objects.

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KINKEAD] asks unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. Surely; of course I will. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, in behalf of—

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. Surely.

Mr. LINTHICUM. The gentleman a moment ago, referring to his "mathematical friend from Maryland," insinuated that I opposed the increase of salary because it was 36 per cent.

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. The gentleman is wrong in his inference. I know that the gentleman from Maryland is intelligent, and I know that he agrees with me in this contention, as every other intelligent gentleman does.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I may admit that I am intelligent, but what I wanted to ask was this, whether the Public Printer recommended 36 per cent increase for the employees, because I am in favor of the employees receiving the same proportionate increase as the Public Printer receives. [Applause.]

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, that is a fair question, and I want to say to my good friend from Maryland that the Public Printer of the United States carries in his pocket a union card, and every man that is in the employ of the Public Printer of the United States—or in the employ of the United States Government under him—is receiving union wages or better, and that is satisfactory to the men and also satisfactory to the membership of this body as a whole.

Fifty-two thousand dollars in salaries was saved, and not a single man over there lost his position; I mean of the workmen; some sinecures were done away with. The increase in the output has been during the past year 25 per cent; and I call this to the attention of my friend from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART], that notwithstanding that increase—a tremendous increase, one-fourth more than they ever did before in the history of the Public Printer's office—notwithstanding this increase, Mr. Ford has been able to reduce the running expenses of his plant \$1,000 each week. I say to the gentleman from Indiana that if I were in his place, with the facts before me as I have presented them to him this afternoon, I would rise in my place and ask that a vote be had on this paragraph, and that it be stricken from the bill. Otherwise, in my judgment, the measure is all right.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. Certainly.

Mr. BARNHART. The gentleman does not know what he is talking about. There is not anything in this paragraph pertaining to the wages of the Public Printer.

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. Of course, I am not talking about the wages of the Public Printer, and the gentleman knows it. I settled that long ago. I am talking about the paragraph in question; and in case the gentleman does not know what paragraph we have in hand, I want to read it to him. It provides:

The Joint Committee on Printing shall have power to adopt and employ such measures as in its discretion may be deemed necessary to remedy any neglect, delay, duplication, or waste in the execution of the public printing and binding and the distribution of Government publications.

Why, the insinuation there is as clear as the noonday sun, and I resent it on behalf of my worthy constituent, a young man who has always helped me in every fight I was ever in. [Applause and laughter.] And I say to the membership of this House this afternoon that whenever the young man in question is in a fight I hope to be here present on the floor of the House and take up the fight in behalf of him as manfully, if not as intelligently, as he has taken it up in my behalf; and I hope when this question is presented to this body this afternoon that without exception the membership of it will vote to strike this iniquitous clause from the measure.

Mr. Chairman, how much of my time remains?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me very unfortunate that at the beginning of the consideration of this bill so much time should be wasted by gentlemen who apparently have not read the bill. We have just been talking about something which the section under discussion does not touch in any way. I want to say for the committee that the committee has the most kindly feeling for the Public Printer. In fact, we take some credit for helping him save that \$52,000 a year, because in the past year we have been working in harmony with the Public Printer.

Later on in this bill the salaries of the different officials, as well as employees, will be fixed. The committee does not have the fixing of the salaries to be paid. You will find that every printer is receiving the full union scale, and probably more, and the rate of pay will be fixed in the bill, and can not be changed again except by Congress. We have taken the position that too much power should not be given to one man, and we have fixed the amount of compensation in this bill.

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will my friend yield right there?

Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania. In a moment. In another section the amount of salary to be paid to the Public Printer is fixed, and we have raised the salary from \$5,500 to \$6,000. If my friend from New Jersey thinks that is not enough, later on he will have an opportunity to offer an amendment to make it

\$7,500 or any amount he thinks fit. The gentleman should get out of his mind any idea that we are making an attack upon the present Public Printer.

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. I know that my friend from Pennsylvania is not making any attack upon the Public Printer, and I listened with great pleasure to the words of praise that fell from his lips regarding Mr. Ford this afternoon. But he is taking the argument advanced by the chairman of the committee, who states that he does not want too much power conferred upon the Public Printer. This is taking away powers now possessed by the man that they regard as the most intelligent Public Printer that the office has ever had, and I submit to the House that since this is not conferring any greater power upon the Public Printer, and it does deprive him of the powers that he now possesses, by virtue of which, despite the fact that the increase in the work has been 25 per cent, he has been able to reduce the running expenses of that magnificent plant \$52,000 a year, or \$1,000 for each week of the calendar year; therefore I hope this paragraph will be stricken from the bill.

Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, in reply to the gentleman's remarks I will say, as has been stated before, that this particular section is practically the existing law.

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. If it is, I submit that there is no need of repeating it here in the bill. What is the necessity, if it is the existing law?

Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania. We are revising and codifying the printing laws.

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. If, as the gentleman says, they have the power now, what is the good of writing it into law? I am sure the gentleman agrees with me. I can tell from the way the gentleman is talking with regard to this measure that he agrees with me on it. [Laughter.]

Mr. LINTHICUM. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to the gentleman from Maryland?

Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania. Certainly.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I understand from the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the salary of the Public Printer is increased by giving him \$500 more, making his salary \$8,000. Are the wages of the employees under the Public Printer increased in proportion to that?

Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, in answer to that question I will say that some of the employees receive increases. The scale of wages named in this bill is based upon the figures secured from the Department of Labor, showing what printers doing the same kind of work in the different sections of the country receive. I would say to the gentleman that the printers in the Government Printing Office are receiving equally as much or more money than anyone else in the same line of work in any printing establishment.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for one-half minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland asks unanimous consent to proceed for half a minute. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, I merely want to say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that I am not objecting to the increase in the pay of the Public Printer. I think he deserves it, and I think the employees under the Public Printer who work behind the linotype machines and in other places in that establishment ought also to receive a proportionate increase in their compensation. It is noticeable that the higher officials in the Government experience very much less difficulty in having their compensation adjusted to a point where the service rendered and the salary paid correspond than the ordinary employees. The latter are compelled to put forth almost heroic efforts if they desire a change from a salary basis established perhaps some 20 or 30 years ago. I am not criticizing the proposed increase in this instance, but what I do wish to call attention to is that we are in duty bound to treat the lesser employees with the same attention and consideration that we do the greater ones.

Mr. GOLDFOGLE. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will say to the gentleman that debate on this amendment is exhausted.

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. I move to strike out the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey moves to strike out the paragraph.

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. Tellers, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey asks for a division.

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. No; I ask for tellers, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 16, noes 25.

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. Tellers, Mr. Chairman.

Tellers were refused, 15 Members—not a sufficient number—seconding the demand.

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of no quorum.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count.

Pending the count,

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I call the attention of the Chair to the fact that a number of gentlemen who have been counted once are now holding up their hands and asking to be counted again.

The CHAIRMAN. The point made by the gentleman from Illinois is well taken. If the Members will stand still for a few moments, the Chair will count. [After counting.] Eighty-seven gentlemen present—not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk proceeded to call the roll, when the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Adair	Doremus	Johnson, S. C.	Peters
Alken	Driscoll	Johnson, Utah	Peterson
Ainey	Eagle	Kelley, Mich.	Phelan
Ansberry	Elder	Kennedy, Conn.	Plumley
Anthony	Esch	Kennedy, R. I.	Porter
Aswell	Estopinal	Kent	Powers
Austin	Fairchild	Key, Ohio	Prouty
Baltz	Faison	Kindel	Rainey
Barchfeld	Ferris	Kirkpatrick	Reilly, Conn.
Barkley	Fess	Knowland, J. R.	Riordan
Bartholdt	Finley	Konop	Rogers
Bartlett	Fitzgerald	Korbly	Rubey
Beall, Tex.	Flood, Va.	Kreider	Russell
Bell, Ga.	Foster	Lafferty	Sabath
Blackmon	Fowler	Langham	Saunders
Borland	Francis	Langley	Shackelford
Brockson	French	Lazaro	Sherley
Broussard	Gallivan	L'Engle	Sherwood
Brown, N. Y.	Gard	Lenroot	Shreve
Browne, Wis.	Gardner	Levy	Sisson
Browning	George	Lewis, Pa.	Smith, Md.
Brumbaugh	Gerry	Lindquist	Smith, N. Y.
Bryan	Gill	Loft	Stanley
Bulkley	Gittins	McAndrews	Steenerson
Burke, Pa.	Glass	McGillcuddy	Stephens, Tex.
Byrnes, S. C.	Graham, Ill.	McGuire, Okla.	Stout
Calder	Graham, Pa.	McKenzie	Stringer
Campbell	Green, Iowa	Mahan	Switzer
Carew	Gregg	Maher	Talbot, Md.
Church	Griest	Martin	Taylor, Colo.
Clancy	Guernsey	Merritt	Thacher
Clark, Fla.	Hamill	Metz	Townsend
Cooper	Hamilton, Mich.	Miller	Tuttle
Copley	Hamilton, N. Y.	Morgan, La.	Underhill
Covington	Hardwick	Morin	Vare
Cramton	Haves	Mott	Walker
Crisp	Heflin	Murdock	Wallin
Curry	Hensley	Murray, Mass.	Watkins
Danforth	Hill	Neeley, Kans.	Whaley
Decker	Hinds	Nolan, J. I.	Whitacre
Dickinson	Hinebaugh	O'Brien	White
Dies	Hobson	O'Leary	Willis
Dillon	Hoxworth	Padgett	Wilson, N. Y.
Dixon	Hulings	Paige, Mass.	Winslow
Doelling	Igoe	Parker	Woodruff
Doollittle	Johnson, Ky.	Patton, Pa.	Woods

The committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PAGE of North Carolina, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 15902, and finding itself without a quorum had caused the roll to be called, when 244 Members responded to their names, and he presented a list of the absentees.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to make a short statement of two minutes regarding the paragraph in question. Some of the Members in the meantime have come in.

Mr. BARNHART. I shall not object, Mr. Chairman, if I am permitted to follow for three minutes.

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. I ask for three minutes also.

The CHAIRMAN. When the committee found itself without a quorum the question was on an amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KINKEAD], and that gentleman now asks that he be allowed to proceed for three minutes by unanimous consent. Is there objection?

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, is it not a fact that tellers were ordered?

The CHAIRMAN. Tellers were not ordered for the lack of a quorum. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, the paragraph in question will be found on page 2 of the bill H. R. 15902. In effect it takes from the Public Printer the powers which he now possesses and places them in the hands of a committee of this

House. During the past year your Public Printer increased the output of that plant, which is under his immediate direction, 25 per cent. Notwithstanding that fact he reduced the running expenses of the Government Printing Office no less than \$1,000 a week. The saving to the United States Government in the aggregate was \$52,000 a year.

The chairman of the Committee on Printing, who should really precede me and I answer him, states that he desires this enacted into law in order to prevent a future Public Printer from committing any acts that he knows the present Public Printer would not be guilty of. I submit to you that this is an insinuation against a man who is now using his powers wisely, using good discretion with regard to the powers that have been conferred upon him, and by the use of those powers has been enabled to save to the people of this country \$52,000 a year and to increase the output of that magnificent plant 25 per cent. We ought to say to him: "Go on, continue intelligently directing this governmental office, and every man of us, whether we are Democrats or whether we are Republicans, will stand by you."

I want to say to my friends on the Republican side that there will be a few friends on our side of the House who are going to vote against my proposition because the Public Printer would not fire out of office some men who are down there. He has given to the men on the Republican side of the House more places than any other man in the Government service.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, that part of the remarks by the gentleman from New Jersey relative to the work and merit of the present Public Printer I agree to, except, possibly, in this: That all of the saving of the \$50,000 claimed by the gentleman from New Jersey may not have been effected by the Public Printer. The members of the Joint Committee on Printing have been acting in conjunction with the Public Printer, and it has aided in selecting stock and letting contracts for paper and machinery, and it claims some little part in the saving, whatever it may have been.

Another matter for your consideration is that this section is practically the reenactment of existing law. The Public Printer is not especially concerned in this; it is merely an effort to break down the bill because it seeks to strengthen, by the amendment of a law that already exists, supervisory control over the Government Printing Office by the House and the Senate. It is our Printing Office, and you have a right by selecting your membership of the joint committee to oversee this Printing Office, and you have a right to exercise some judgment as to what is going to be done and what not. This paragraph provides that the joint committee shall, in conjunction with the Public Printer, exercise the best judgment of the combined efforts of the two to provide for you such documents as you and your constituents will need and in distributing them in the most economical and efficient way possible.

Mr. CARLIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes.

Mr. CARLIN. I understood the gentleman to say that the committee shall, in connection with the Public Printer, do so-and-so. There is no such provision in the paragraph.

Mr. BARNHART. I want to say to the gentleman from Virginia that this paragraph is further emphasized and amplified in section 81 of the bill.

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. Well, let us strike this out now.

Mr. BARNHART. I decline to yield to the gentleman; the gentleman has had his time. I want to say that this enactment is largely a reaffirmation of existing law. The committee believes that we ought to have some control over the printing in which you are all interested. It merely undertakes to establish the fact that we have a right in this House, through our Committee on Printing, to print such documents as we choose and to exercise control over Government printing so as to prevent possible scandals such as once arose and gave us four Public Printers in a single year because of purchases that were made, to the discredit of the Government officers involved.

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes.

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. I understood the chairman of the committee to say that he was perfectly satisfied with the manner in which the present Public Printer had conducted his office.

Mr. BARNHART. I am; he has conducted it well, with the aid of the joint committee.

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. What is the necessity of writing this into the law, and by inference saying that the man who has saved the Government this great sum of money and has increased the efficiency of the office—

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to have my time taken up by the gentleman from New Jersey, who has already had his full time. The paragraph insinuates nothing of the kind.

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. If the gentleman will read the paragraph, he will see that it does.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired, and the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey to strike out section 2, paragraph 1.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey) there were 54 ayes and 59 noes.

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART] and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KINKEAD].

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were 66 ayes and 76 noes.

So the amendment was lost.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. PAR. 2. The Joint Committee on Printing is hereby authorized to inquire at any time into all matters pertaining to the public printing and binding and the distribution of publications for Congress, the various executive and judicial departments, independent offices, and establishments of the Government, to report to Congress from time to time any abuses in the public printing and binding and the distribution of Government publications, and to recommend such remedial legislation as in its judgment may seem proper.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 25, at the beginning of the line, strike out the words "and judicial."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I was unable to secure any time from the chairman of the committee in general debate, but I desire to call the attention of the House to a matter in connection with the distribution of Government documents which perhaps is well known to the older Members of the House, but which perhaps may not be known to those who have recently come into the body. On March 11, 1914, I introduced House resolution 435, requiring an investigation by the Committee on Printing of the manner in which the publication known as the Messages and Papers of the Presidents was being sold to the public. After introducing the resolution, I made inquiries to ascertain if the subject had ever been brought to the attention of any prior Congress and learned that it had been investigated during the year 1900 and that a full report thereon was made to the Senate, which report can be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the proceedings of the Fifty-sixth Congress, page 5834. But, Mr. Chairman, it seems that, notwithstanding the investigation which was made by the Senate at that time, the public are still being deceived with reference to the sale of this Government publication.

I am perfectly aware of the fact that Congress, when the publication was authorized, did convey to the gentleman who arranged the matter for the publication the plates that were used in the publication, and that Congress has not since that time authorized any further printing of the sets at public expense. But I wish to advise the House that the company or individuals who are now representing themselves to be the owners of these plates and authorized to sell the sets are taking advantage of the fact that the publication was authorized by Congress originally. They are imposing upon the public and securing their patronage largely by the representations they are making that Members of Congress are in some way responsible for and are interested in its present sale and distribution.

In other words, agents are going into my district and into the districts of many Representatives, and are saying to prospective customers that they have secured their names from Members of Congress; that particular selection has been made of these names in each of the districts in order that this work of great national interest may be distributed among those who are particularly favored. I have in my hand letters which I have received from people living in Colorado, Maryland, Indiana, and in other States, complaining about the deception and imposition which have been practiced upon them by those who are at the present time endeavoring to sell this publication. I wish to state, Mr. Chairman, that it is possible to secure a set of the Messages in some of the secondhand book stores throughout the country at a price as low as three or five dollars per set. The superintendent of documents informs me that he has

many sets for sale at eight or ten dollars a set. Notwithstanding this, contracts are being procured throughout the country calling for the delivery of these volumes for as high as \$59.50 per set. The method pursued by the gentleman agent when he arrives in a city is to interview the prominent men, present the attractiveness of the volumes, and mention the fact that the Congressman from that district has selected a few influential persons to be the recipients of the publication, secure a small payment down, and then take notes or contracts from the purchasers for the balance. In many sections of the country there is evidence of this campaign of misrepresentation, and it is injurious to Members of Congress. People are complaining that the names of Congressmen are being used to facilitate the false and misleading sale of this publication, and I am satisfied from my investigation of the subject that there should be some general publicity given to the fact that this publication can be had at such a small price, and that Members of Congress have no connection whatever with the distribution or sale of the work.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to be permitted to proceed for two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. Mr. Chairman, I wish to read a paragraph from a letter which I received from a gentleman in the State of Colorado, in which he says:

I was told how highly Congressmen value this work as a reference, and was even shown parts of a discussion where Congressmen had discussed the advisability of distributing this work free of charge in the interest of higher education, and was told that it was finally decided that each Congressman should be allowed to designate a certain number of persons in his district who should receive this work, but that the recipients should be allowed to pay the actual expenses of publishing and distribution.

Mr. Chairman, I think the recital that I have made demonstrates the necessity for close supervision on the part of a duly authorized and empowered committee of Congress of the work of distributing public documents, especially those that are of particular value. I believe that Congress was to blame for parting with the plates from which this publication was made, and without making any criticism whatever of the party who received the plates, I am inclined to think that it would have been much better for Congress to have made an appropriation to pay for the preparation of this valuable work, and thus have relieved itself of the imputation against it created throughout the country by the false and misleading statements that have been made by those who are directing and controlling its sale.

Mr. Chairman, in order that the membership of the House may have some knowledge of the course being followed by the agents of parties who are interested in the sale of the Messages and Papers of the Presidents I desire to insert the following letters in the RECORD:

BALTIMORE, March 14, 1914.

Representative SELDOMRIDGE,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I notice by the Baltimore Evening News, under date of March 12, 1914, that you have introduced a resolution in Congress asking for an investigation of the private sales of the publication known as Messages and Papers of the Presidents.

I write this to congratulate you on taking this action and to say that I as a member of the bar of this city have many cases where suits have been entered by the Army and Navy Magazine, a crowd operating in the city of New York, but using, as far as I am advised and can understand, the name of the Government in the sale of these books. I can give you the detailed history of a half dozen cases in the city of Baltimore in regard to their sale. If you are interested and care to have the information I will send the same to you, as it does seem to me that it has been the use of the name of the Government that has enabled these gentlemen to sell these books.

Yours, truly,

JOHN L. G. LEE.

CRIPPLE CREEK, COLO., March 17, 1914.

Hon. H. H. SELDOMRIDGE, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Recent press dispatches have it that you have introduced a resolution asking that the method of sale and distribution of a certain set of books entitled "Messages and Papers of the Presidents," published by the Army and Navy Magazine, of New York and Washington, be investigated. I realize that this resolution can not impair any contract which has been made, but it appears to me, since I am one of the many who purchased this set of books at \$59, that there was some fraud practiced in making the sale.

When the salesman asked me to buy he said that my name had been given by some Congressman and that there were but 11 names in town. Since that time I have ascertained that some 20 sets of books were sold. In view of the above it might establish sufficient fraud on the part of the Army and Navy Magazine to have the contract set aside. Awaiting any suggestions you might make, I am,

Yours, very truly,

H. C. DENNY.

COLORADO SPRINGS, COLO., October 11, 1913.

Mr. H. H. SELDOMRIDGE,
Colorado Springs, Colo.

MY DEAR MR. SELDOMRIDGE: I did not find the statement regarding the publication of the Messages from the Presidents in 11 volumes that I spoke to you about. I only have the subscription blank which I first had made out and which I had canceled, as I told you and which I am inclosing herewith.

The agent's name was James B. Wooster, Jr. He first reached me with the statement that the selected list of names in Colorado Springs as beneficiaries was suggested by some one or more of the Congressmen or Representatives in Washington, although he did not know who they were as the information came to him in a letter from the President of the Army and Navy Magazine Co. With this he had some circulars which contained the resolution of Congress granting to Col. Richardson the plates, type, vignettes, etc., from which all of the copies of the messages and papers had been printed for Congress, and granting this without consideration other than in recognition of his services in compiling these. He further told me that they were issuing 85,000 sets of these books, which at \$59.50 would mean nearly \$5,000,000, of which it is safe to say from a view of the books that 50 per cent is profit less the agents' commissions. It would appear that in some way this matter which has been compiled for the Government and probably at very great expense is being exploited for private ends. That part of the matter, while I consider it wrong, is of less importance to me than the fact that the agents who have been going around the country representing the publication as a Government publication and securing the attention of possible subscribers by the unauthorized method used by this Mr. Wooster, who came to see me. If he had represented himself as a book agent or bookseller he probably knew as did also the officers of the Army and Navy Magazine that he could not get the ear of the usual business man, and therefore they were fortified with the letters and statement of which I have told you representing the whole matter as emanating from Congress and the Government instead of from a private concern and exploiting the matter for private ends.

Yours,

E. C. VAN DIEST.

DENVER, COLO., March 14, 1914.

Representative SELDOMRIDGE, of Colorado,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Some time ago I was called upon by a representative of the Army and Navy Magazine, who described to me a political and economical history of the United States prepared for the special benefit of Congressmen for their enlightenment on the questions of State, at the expense of the Government.

I was told that this work contained valuable information on the science of government, besides giving a complete history of the United States, from the landing of the Pilgrim Fathers until the present time. I was told how highly Congressmen valued this work, as a reference, and was even shown parts of a discussion where Congressmen had discussed the advisability of distributing this work free in the interests of higher education, and was told that it was finally decided that each Congressman should be allowed to designate a certain number of persons in his district who should receive this work, but that the recipient should be allowed to pay the actual expenses of publishing and distribution.

I was told that my employer was designated by the Representative from this district to receive this great work, and as it happened that he was out of town, the salesman took the liberty of allowing me to subscribe.

Imagine my feelings when this work arrived and I found it to be the Presidents' Messages to Congress, bound in book form.

After examining the work, I notified the Army and Navy Magazine that I had very carefully repacked each volume and held them for shipping instructions.

They immediately notified me that at the time I subscribed and paid \$8 in cash to the salesman, I had signed a note for \$59.50 and that they proposed to collect it.

What do you advise? Shall I simply keep quiet and allow them to sue me or shall I consign the books to them charges collect and begin suit against them for the \$8 which I paid before receiving books?

Thanking you very cordially in advance for your reply, I remain,

Yours, very truly,

J. J. LITTON.

WORCESTER, MASS, March 15, 1914.

Hon. HARRY H. SELDOMRIDGE, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am glad to notice that you have started an inquiry into the private sale of Messages and Papers of the Presidents.

That set of books is being exploited in this vicinity, and several cases of sales through misrepresentation have come to my attention, so that a few weeks ago I sent to our local papers a note of warning. I inclose a copy of it, with my best wishes for the success of your effort both to get at the facts and to bring it about that the mistake made by Congress in giving the plates of this public document to a private individual may not soon be repeated.

Yours, very truly,

GEORGE H. HAYNES.

The following letter was printed in the Worcester Evening Post, of Worcester, Mass., in its issue of March 5 last:

SET OF BOOKS THAT HAVE SOME HISTORY—PROF. HAYNES TELLS OF "MESSAGES OF PRESIDENTS."

MARCH 4, 1914.

To the Editor of the Post.

SIR: At the present time eloquent agents are taking subscriptions in Massachusetts for a notable set of books. The Messages and Papers of the Presidents have an interesting history, with which the prospective buyer may do well to familiarize himself before being stampeded into signing the subscription blank.

July 27, 1894, Congress authorized the compilation of all the messages and papers of the Presidents, placing the work in the hands of the Joint Committee on Printing. That committee requested the Hon. James D. Richardson, then a Congressman from Tennessee, to make the compilation. He expended much time on this work, and later, at an expense of some \$3,600, indexed the series.

Three editions of the "Messages," aggregating 36,000 sets of 10 volumes each, were "printed by the Government Printing Office and distributed free by Members and officers of the two Houses of Congress."

The printing act of 1895 made it illegal to copyright any Government publication. It is a question for acute lawyers to determine how—in the face of that prohibition—a copyright within three years did get issued to James D. Richardson. Formal congressional inquiry has been directed upon that question, with unsatisfactory results.

The sundry civil bill, which became a law June 4, 1897, contained this provision: "That the Public Printer be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to make and deliver to James D. Richardson, the compiler of Messages and Papers of the Presidents, without cost to him, duplicate electrotype plates from which the compilation of Messages and Papers of the Presidents is published."

The incidents to which this unprecedented act gave rise are set forth in a special investigation by the Senate Committee on Printing (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 33, pp. 5834-5835, May 22, 1900). The committee declares that in making this grant to James D. Richardson Congress "made a mistake." If anything more than a gracious public acknowledgment of the value of his work was due to Mr. Richardson, it should have been paid in money, duly appropriated for the purpose.

The report states that soon after this grant a contract was entered into under which, for a royalty to James D. Richardson of 75 cents per set for all sets sold, a certain publisher obtained "the exclusive use of the plates." A few months later this publisher abandoned his former trade name and assumed for his new enterprise the name, "committee on distribution," and in booming his wares used many expressions "such as necessarily to mislead the public into the belief that the Government was in some way identified with the publication and sale of his books." * * * Persons addressed as prospective purchasers were told that the "committee on distribution" had been "appointed to distribute the work" and that Congress had "granted the privilege of printing a limited edition" and that the "distribution" was to be made by "congressional districts" and that the "number of sets" had been "apportioned" in accordance with a "ratio."

The report declared that Richardson's receipts from royalties on sales thus promoted, up to the period of the investigation, had amounted to \$11,320.50. It concluded: "Congress has in its own power to avoid a repetition of the false representations of which it has been the victim by not again placing Government plates at the disposition of private persons. The language of the statute forbidding the copyrighting of Government publications appears to the committee to be as strong as it can be made."

March 1, 1901, this set of books figured again in Senate debate when Senator GALLINGER advocated the printing of a new edition, 6,000 to be distributed by Senators and Representatives and 10,000 to be held by the superintendent of public documents and sold at the actual cost of publication. In urging the importance of this last provision he said: "Here are gentlemen going over the country imposing upon the people of this country by selling a public document for \$35 that can be published for about \$9 or \$10, and they have brought themselves into such disrepute that a judge, Justice Childs, of the Supreme Court of the State of New York, said the other day: 'The plain purpose of the person who originated this system of obtaining subscribers for these books was to defraud the public. Such a scheme, permeated with fraud from start to finish, should not be permitted by sanction of any court to succeed.'"

Senator GALLINGER continued: "I have a mass of documents here which show that a gigantic fraud is being perpetrated upon the people of this country."

Such are some of the salient points in the history of this work down to 1901. The writer had no difficulty in securing, gratis for the W. P. I. and for his own library, sets of this work from a Member of Congress at the very time when subscribers in this city were being induced to pay \$35 and over for the sets put out by the "committee on distribution." That 10-volume set, covering the "Messages and papers of the Presidents" from Washington to McKinley, inclusive, is now on sale by the superintendent of public documents—as he assured me February 12, 1914—at \$9 a set.

In recent months "Messages and papers of the Presidents" have again come upon the scene in the hands of eloquent agents. It is now put out by the Army and Navy Magazine, but in none of its circulars or letterheads do the names of persons connected with it appear. Is the "committee on distribution" operating under a new name?

It should be distinctly noted for all that it is worth that there has now been added an eleventh volume, not a part of any Government publication, including the State papers of Presidents Roosevelt and Taft, and an "encyclopedic index" now makes cross-reference easily possible between these messages, etc., and those of the earlier Presidents. The prospective purchaser would do well to determine whether, aside from the inclusion of these most accessible papers of the last two administrations and the consequent changes in the index, any other modification whatever has been made in these sets of books.

A 50-page pamphlet is used to boom these books. It contains some 400 flattering comments, largely from former Congressmen. Not one of them now bears a date. It would be interesting to know how large a proportion of them appeared after the above-mentioned report was submitted in the Senate.

The prospective purchaser is again being assured that this rare and never-to-be-repeated opportunity comes to him because his name chances to be on the agent's list, there being but a limited number of sets assigned to each congressional district.

The minimum price is now about \$50, and as much more as the purchaser wants to invest in fancy binding.

Now, before the prospective purchaser is stamped into the patriotic act of signing a subscription blank for these books, he may do well to consider whether the addition of the State papers of Presidents Roosevelt and Taft, with a suitable index, increases by \$40 the value of a public document which he can buy at any time for \$9.

The earlier set is accessible in every public library of any size and literally in tens of thousands of private libraries. It can never be a "rarity," for 36,000 sets have been put out by the Public Printer, while—if the Senate report is accurate—15,000 more sets had been sold, subject to royalty, before 1901.

The 11 volumes make a stately procession on the purchaser's shelves. As Abraham Lincoln said, under similar circumstances, "This is a very good kind of a book for the man who wants this kind of a book."

GEORGE H. HAYNES,
Worcester Polytechnic Institute.

Prof. George H. Haynes, of the department of economics and political science in the Worcester Polytechnic Institute, does a real public service in his warning, elsewhere, against the subscription-book exploitation of what is, to the extent he explains, a governmental publication.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Colorado has again expired.

Mr. MANN rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois moves to strike out the last two words.

Mr. MANN. No, Mr. Chairman; I oppose the motion of the gentleman, I do not think it ought to be stricken out.

Mr. Chairman, the fraud and deceit referred to by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SELDOMBRIDGE] has been running for a great many years. I have not heard of it recently, although I should think 10 or 12 years ago they were having some of this in my district, and they may be yet, for all I know. The whole case is an illustration of the need that Congress ought to be very careful with what it possesses. Mr. Richardson, of Tennessee, recently deceased, was the ranking Democrat on the Committee on Printing of the House and was the minority or Democratic leader of the House. He had a very high standing in the House when he was a Member of the House, and has since had a high standing in the country in the position that he occupied. He edited the Messages and Papers of the Presidents, I believe, in the main, because he was a member of the Committee on Printing, and had been for a considerable time the authority in the House on printing, and at the time even when he was on the minority side of the House Congress ordered the Messages and Papers of the President printed twice, as I recall it, for distribution. There was one distribution ordered after I became a Member of the House. There had been another distribution ordered before I became a Member of the House. Mr. Richardson had received no pay for editing those reports. I do not know how much work there was involved in the editing of the reports; I assume not very much work, so far as he was concerned, but some work and some responsibility, and in the closing days of one of the Congresses, the Fifty-fifth or Fifty-sixth, I think, Mr. Richardson suggested that having received no pay, and he did this privately, and the Government having finished its publication of the set, it might very properly present to him the plates, which were lying in the Government Printing Office, of no value to anyone except for the metal contained in them, so far as the Government was concerned, and in a spirit of generosity and fairness the House inserted a provision in one of the bills presenting those plates to Mr. Richardson.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. BARNHART. I think the gentleman might have given a mistaken impression in the statement that the Government gave the plates to Mr. Richardson. There was a duplicate set of plates, and one was given over to him and the other is still kept in the possession of the Government, and the Government is now ready to print these documents as there may be demand for them. They are for sale at the document room at \$10 per set.

Mr. MANN. I did not even know there were duplicate sets; that was not my understanding at the time. I do not deny, of course, the gentleman's authority.

Mr. BARNHART. That is my information.

Mr. MANN. My recollection is, we presented the plates in the Government Printing Office to Mr. Richardson. Maybe there were duplicate plates; very likely there may have been several sets of plates in printing so large an edition of that work. Shortly thereafter a company or association was organized with a title intending to make people believe that it was composed of Congressmen or Congress itself, and Mr. Richardson, I think—foolishly, as I think he would have said himself, probably, after his experience with the matter—improperly turned those plates over to this association for some compensation. What that was I know nothing about. I think he had no control over the matter, had no part in the deceit and fraud which was practiced; but whoever had charge of this association immediately started out to lie to the public. I am afraid we never will be able through legislation to compel all book agents to confine themselves strictly to the truth. [Laughter.]

Mr. SELDOMBRIDGE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. SELDOMBRIDGE. The records show that Mr. Richardson received a royalty of 75 cents per set from this company, and that his total receipts from the use of the plates was something like \$11,250.

Mr. MANN. Well, he made an agreement and I do not know what the agreement was. I know this, that if Congress were as careful as it ought to be it would not through a spirit of generosity present anything to any Member of the House who is not entitled to it under the law, and even now we have become so stingy that most of the gentlemen on that side of the

House are going to lose most of their August salary. [Laughter and applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. PAR. 1. The Joint Committee on Printing shall appoint a clerk, an inspector, and a stenographer, at \$3,000, \$2,000, and \$1,000 per annum, respectively, to be appropriated for and paid by the Secretary of the Senate. The clerk and inspector as provided for in this section shall each give bond for the faithful performance of their respective duties in the sum of \$5,000, to be approved by the Joint Committee on Printing.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Would the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART] have any objection to an amendment to strike out the language "Secretary of the Senate" and insert in lieu thereof "Clerk of the House of Representatives"?

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, I do not know that it makes any difference whatever, so that they receive their money. The purpose of fixing it in that way was that the pay responsibility should not be divided. It all comes out of the general fund, anyhow. This simplifies matters.

Mr. MANN. In the main I am in favor of the pending bill, but it seems to me that we ought not to entirely eliminate the House of Representatives when it comes to the term "Congress." Here is a proposition to give to the Joint Committee on Printing absolute power over the expenditure of \$5,000,000 which is expended in the Government Printing Office. The Joint Committee on Printing is presided over by a Senator. He, in effect, names the clerk of the Joint Committee on Printing. The clerk practically acts as the Joint Committee on Printing during vacations of Congress. If we ever have any more, and has a great influence and must have great influence on the Joint Committee on Printing when Congress is in session.

Now, heretofore he has felt somewhat under obligations to the House because he received half of his pay, as he does now, from the Clerk of the House. He is obliged to be courteous at least to the Clerk of the House, if not to the Members of the House. Now, he proposes in this bill to have his salary paid to him entirely by the Secretary of the Senate. He serves under a Senator; he is named by a Senator; he is paid by the Senate. He is considered, and necessarily, as an employee of the Senate. Now, the clerk of the Joint Committee on Printing—the very efficient present one, and very capable and very courteous—is only human. I have noticed through an experience of some years that a man is always more courteous to the person from whom he receives his pay than he is to anybody else. Yet we propose here to deliberately cut out even in name the House of Representatives and to have this clerk paid by the Secretary of the Senate.

You say it is a matter of convenience to have him paid by one person. All right. As he is named by the Senate, let him be paid by the Clerk of the House instead of the Secretary of the Senate. Then he would be very courteous to the Members of the House who go to see him, because he gets his pay from the House. He will be courteous to the Senate, because he gets his appointment from the Senate, but if he gets both from the Senate he will tell us to "go to."

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

It is immaterial to the committee as to who will be the paymaster of the clerk of the Joint Committee on Printing and its other employees. But I want to correct the impression that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] has doubtless unintentionally given, and that is that the selection of the clerk of the Joint Committee on Printing is done by any Senator. The clerk of the Joint Committee on Printing under the law is elected by a vote of the membership of the joint committee, composed of three Members of the House and three Members of the Senate. Therefore no Senator has any authority or any right to name the clerk of the committee. But this position is an especially important one. It requires a man who has expert knowledge of paper, and he must really be the referee for the Joint Committee on Printing in many of these matters that come before the committee, and under the provision of this law there has been an enlargement to the extent that he is placed under a \$5,000 bond for the faithful performance of his duty in the matter of aiding the Joint Committee on Printing in passing upon the kind of paper and material that is purchased for the Government Printing Office.

Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Illinois wants to make a motion to amend the bill by changing the paymaster from the Secretary of the Senate to the Clerk of the House of Representatives, the committee will accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. WEEB). Does the gentleman from Indiana withdraw his pro forma amendment?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend, page 3, line 9, by striking out the words "Secretary of the Senate" and inserting in lieu thereof "Clerk of the House of Representatives."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 9, strike out the words "Secretary of the Senate" and insert in lieu thereof the words "Clerk of the House of Representatives."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4. PAR. 2. The Joint Committee on Printing shall fix upon standards of paper of every description which, in its judgment, will be required by the Government Printing Office for all the purposes of the public printing and binding for the several executive departments, independent offices, and establishments of the Government, and the Public Printer shall, under the direction of the said committee, advertise in two newspapers or trade journals published in each of the cities of Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Washington, Cincinnati, St. Louis, Chicago, and San Francisco and secure proposals to furnish the Government with paper, as specified in the schedule prescribed by the Joint Committee on Printing and to be furnished to applicants by the Public Printer, setting forth in detail the quantities and qualities required for the public printing and binding, and the Public Printer shall furnish samples of the standards of papers fixed upon to applicants therefor who may desire to bid.

Mr. BARNHART and Mr. GOOD rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART] is recognized.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer three committee amendments to this paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana offers three committee amendments. The Clerk will report the first amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, line 19, after the words "San Francisco," strike out the words "and secure" and insert the words "for sealed."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Also the following committee amendment was read:

Page 4, lines 21 and 22, after the word "printing" in line 21, strike out the words "and to be furnished to applicants by the Public Printer."

The amendment was agreed to.

Also the following committee amendment was read:

Page 4, line 24, after the word "furnish," insert the words "a schedule and."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BATHRICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes.

Mr. BATHRICK. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask the chairman of the committee this question: I presume the purpose of advertising for bids in this paragraph is to secure numerous applicants for the contracts. Is that it?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes; to secure by advertisement and specific notice bids on contracts to be let.

Mr. BATHRICK. Are there any large trade journals circulating among those establishments that provide paper? Are they not particularly published in trade journals that circulate among those establishments?

Mr. BARNHART. It says "trade journals or newspapers."

Mr. BATHRICK. It says "advertise in two newspapers or trade journals" in the cities named. What is the object of saying "newspapers," ordinary newspapers?

Mr. BARNHART. There might not be a trade journal in a locality where there is a large paper manufacturing or paper selling industry.

Mr. BATHRICK. Has the gentleman ever calculated the possible cost of naming a schedule of the quality and quantity of the paper he desires to buy and the cost of advertising?

Mr. BARNHART. The total cost will be something like \$1,000 a year as proposed and that is a reduction from the present number of publications.

Mr. BATHRICK. The gentleman thinks it will be less than a thousand dollars?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes; I think it will be less than that. But I want to explain further to the gentleman from Ohio, who is a business man and understands that these contractors are patrons of clipping bureaus. They have clipping bureaus that provide them with all sorts of notices having to do with their business. The purpose of this variety of publicity localities is to secure advertisements all over the United States in such places as would produce the best results possible.

Mr. BATHRICK. I will say that the gentleman's explanation is very satisfactory. I had no idea that the cost of advertising could be so little.

Mr. BARNHART. These advertisements merely announce that there will be a letting of contracts, and that the plans and specifications may be had upon application.

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by inserting a few letters and a newspaper article on the subject of the distribution of the Messages of the Presidents.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Colorado asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Goon] moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. GOOD. This section provides for advertisements in two newspapers or trade journals published in each of the cities of Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Washington, Cincinnati, St. Louis, Chicago, and San Francisco for proposals to furnish the Government with paper. Not more than six months ago, at an expense of about \$70,000, a committee composed of the Secretary of the Treasury and the other members of the organization committee of the Federal Reserve Board made a trip over this country to locate the various Federal reserve banks, and they selected certain cities that were regarded as the great commercial centers of the United States. It seems to me that if that information is worth anything—if it is worth anything like what it cost—it ought to be followed by a committee in bringing out a great bill like this.

I am surprised to see that the committee has inserted the city of Washington and the city of Baltimore, cities not mentioned by the organization committee of the Federal Reserve Board, but has failed to insert the city of Richmond and the city of Atlanta. [Laughter on the Republican side.] Why is it that all of the cities named in this provision are cities of the North? Why is it that you have not named Richmond, or New Orleans, or Kansas City, or Galveston, or Dallas, or some of the other southern cities where the Government should insert in the newspapers advertisements for bids? Is it possible that advertisements in the newspapers for paper in those cities would be worthless? The Government purchases a large amount of paper from the South, especially from West Virginia. Is it possible that the Committee on Printing does not regard those cities as of sufficient importance to even insert a newspaper advertisement there?

I want to congratulate the city of Baltimore that it is again placed upon the map. But what of Richmond? Where are the gentlemen from Virginia to-day at this home-coming of the House [laughter], when the great city of Richmond is being discriminated against, and has been entirely left out of consideration in this bill? The newspapers of that city will not be permitted to publish and therefore to receive pay for publishing advertisements for paper? Where is Atlanta, placed on the map by the organization committee of the reserve board? Even great Atlanta is not mentioned.

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOOD. Certainly.

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. Will not the gentleman pay a tribute of appreciation to the generosity of Atlanta and Richmond in yielding to Baltimore and these other cities some matters of commercial importance?

Mr. GOOD. Yes; and I was wondering about Colorado. I fail to see Denver on the map as reported by the gentleman's committee.

Mr. SELDOMRIDGE. We have relinquished our claims to Kansas City.

Mr. GOOD. But Kansas City is not on the list. I simply wished to call the attention of the committee to this matter. I suppose the committee had some good explanation for this discrimination, but I do not know what it is. The discrimination calls for an explanation.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, in reply to the very entertaining but far-fetched remarks of the gentleman from Iowa, I had explained in a previous statement that the advertisements in these cities are not based upon their being commercial centers or financial centers, but upon the fact that they are the cities in which are located some of the largest paper manufacturers and paper dealers, and they are located so we could probably get the broadest advertisement in those localities. For instance, San Francisco is a great coast city and Chicago and St. Louis are centers of the great West. We omitted some of the cities from the former list that we had because we received few replies from advertisements in papers published in those cities.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. How about Washington? Is there a paper manufacturer in the city of Washington?

Mr. BARNHART. No; but there are some of the most extensive paper dealers in the United States represented here.

Mr. GOOD. Does the gentleman mean to say that the newspapers—

Mr. BARNHART. As I understand it, many paper manufacturers in the country have agents in Washington. Now, Mr. Chairman, this little notice, of which the gentleman is making much ado, is about a 6 or 7 inch single-column advertisement, and it is of little consequence really, because the world at large sees very little of it. It is purely a paper-trade matter.

Mr. J. M. C. SMITH. Mr. Chairman, I should like to know whether the committee, in considering the cities where this printing should be done, considered the city of Kalamazoo, which has the largest book-print paper mills in the world?

Mr. BARNHART. I will say to the gentleman that the committee did consider it, but the committee understands that most of the product of the Kalamazoo mills is marketed through the city of Chicago and other big commercial centers. There are many paper agencies in the city of Chicago and elsewhere, and we could not extend this to all the cities that have paper mills. In fact, we cut out about four cities that we had used heretofore, because very small or inconsequential results had been obtained from advertisements published therein.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I will ask the gentleman if he considered putting the advertisement in the Portland or Seattle papers?

Mr. BARNHART. I do not know that we considered that, but we decided that a San Francisco publication would reach those cities through the trade journals and clipping bureaus to which I have referred.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I will say to the gentleman that I think he is mistaken about the paper mills of the Pacific coast being in the neighborhood of San Francisco. They are on the Columbia River and on Puget Sound, and one of the largest manufacturers in the United States of print paper used in the publication of books is located at Everett, in the State of Washington. I do not understand why you did not provide for printing the advertisement at a place in some one of those Northwestern States.

Mr. BARNHART. I have no explanation of it, except that which I have stated, just as I explained to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. J. M. C. SMITH], that these are the same cities that have been on the list heretofore. The fact that there are a number of paper mills on some river in the Northwest does not necessarily indicate that the agents of those mills are not located at San Francisco or some other great commercial center.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Is it a fact that the gentleman made no investigation about the matter, but simply followed the old list, because he saw San Francisco there, and made no investigation about the Northwest?

Mr. BARNHART. The committee followed it for the reason that the cities mentioned in this bill have been used for this advertising purpose for a good many years, and the results have been eminently satisfactory, so we saw no occasion for changing. But, on the other hand, we did see the lack of necessity for using as many cities as had been used before, and with the consent of the Public Printer and agreement of all concerned we decided that it would be just as well to drop about four of the cities that we have been using heretofore, because we realized that the few bids from these cities would come through other notices anyway.

Mr. J. M. C. SMITH. I will ask the gentleman if the committee would be willing to include Kalamazoo?

Mr. BARNHART. I think it is hardly necessary to do that.

Mr. J. M. C. SMITH. I move to insert in line 17, after the word "of" and before the word "Boston," the word "Kalamazoo."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, line 17, after the word "of" where it occurs the second time, insert the word "Kalamazoo."

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. J. M. C. SMITH) there were—ayes 23, noes 35.

Accordingly the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I move to amend by inserting the word "Seattle" after the words "San Francisco" in line 19, page 4.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, line 19, after the words "San Francisco," insert the word "Seattle."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I want to be heard on this amendment for a moment.

I offer this amendment because of the fact that the great timber region of this country on the Pacific coast is not at San Francisco. I do not have the facts at hand, but I have no doubt myself that most of the wood pulp and paper of the Pacific coast is made in the States of Oregon and Washington. I know the great paper supply of the Pacific Northwest is in that portion of the country. I know there are paper mills on the Columbia River, very large ones, and in other portions of the States of Washington and Oregon. I do not understand why the advertisement should be inserted at San Francisco, a thousand miles away from the timber region where paper is produced.

The gentleman from Indiana is mistaken about San Francisco papers circulating much in the Northwest. I want the gentleman from Indiana to recollect that it is fully a thousand miles by rail from San Francisco to Seattle.

At Everett, where the gentleman from Washington, my colleague, Mr. FALCONER, lives, they have a large mill producing book paper exclusively. I can not understand why you should not have an advertisement in the region which produces the paper, instead of a thousand miles away, and I suppose the only reason is that the committee followed the custom without making any investigation whatever.

Mr. FALCONER. Will the gentleman from Indiana yield to me?

Mr. BARNHART. Certainly.

Mr. FALCONER. What method outside of newspaper advertisement does the Government have for bringing to the attention of paper concerns the quality of the paper desired for the purposes of the Government?

Mr. BARNHART. The Government Printing Office has a list of every concern in the country that it can secure, and sends to them notice of these lettings and the specifications besides.

Mr. FALCONER. The specifications are bound in pamphlet form, something like what the gentleman has on his desk?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes.

Mr. FALCONER. I want to say that a few months ago I sent the Everett Paper & Pulp Mill, which is a large manufacturing paper plant, turning out the finest quality of book paper, a list and specifications required, and I received a letter saying that they were glad to get it, as it gave them a better idea than any trade journal had given them before. That was probably two months ago.

Mr. BARNHART. If those gentlemen had read the advertisement, if they had seen the trade paper, it was their fault if they have not received the schedules, because they are invited to send for them.

Mr. FALCONER. The gentleman from Indiana said that they were sent out by the department.

Mr. BARNHART. I said they were sent to all paper contractors.

Mr. FALCONER. Then they do not send them to the mills?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes; they send to all that are on their list.

Mr. FALCONER. Does not the gentleman think it would be advisable to insert advertisements in papers that are less than a thousand miles from the plant?

Mr. BARNHART. Does not the mill referred to by the gentleman have an agency at San Francisco and also at Chicago?

Mr. FALCONER. Why have an agency at San Francisco or Chicago?

Mr. BARNHART. If the gentleman has had any experience in buying paper, he will know that we rarely buy it of the mills that manufacture it, but of jobbers. I know in newspaper and job stock, and very largely the Government purchases, we buy of agents, jobbing and wholesale houses, and not direct from the mills. In some instances large mills do furnish it direct by contract, but ordinarily they have jobbing houses that take all the product of the mills. The product of the mills, as I understand it, is sold very largely in advance. The paper agents take the whole product of the mill. I remember for many years during my business experience I bought of the J. W. Butler Paper Co., of Chicago, Kalamazoo paper.

Mr. FALCONER. I have no interest in a paper getting an advertisement; it is a matter of efficiency in getting the supply. It occurs to me that when paper is manufactured from raw material in a locality it might be advisable to advertise in that vicinity. I am glad to have the explanation of the gentleman from Indiana, but I see no reason why we should not advertise in the Seattle papers and in the Everett papers.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, by way of explanation, we might place advertisements in towns and cities all over the

United States where there is a paper agent and where there is a paper mill, but it has been the experience of the committee that we get the same results in the present method, because this is merely an announcement of letting, and these agents, I think—those who contract on an extensive scale—are patrons of commercial clipping bureaus and get the notices of lettings through them.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARNHART. Certainly.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I would like to call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that you have not designated a single city in that portion of the country where the great timber supply is, and not only that, but in all that great Northwest where two-thirds of the paper supply of the United States is, you have not designated a single city.

Mr. BARNHART. Neither have we as to the supply of straw-board or Bristol board or the finest quality of writing paper.

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARNHART. Certainly.

Mr. FALCONER. Mr. Chairman, I have the floor, as I understand it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington has the floor.

Mr. FALCONER. Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the gentleman that San Francisco is not the whole Pacific coast. The city of Seattle is some nine hundred and odd miles distant from San Francisco. Baltimore and Washington are 40 miles apart, and yet there are advertisements in the respective papers of those two cities. Apparently to the limited mental horizon of an easterner from the State of Indiana a thousand miles on the Pacific coast does not amount to as much as 40 miles in this part of the country. It seems to me the gentleman ought to enlarge his mental vision a little and get some idea of the great western country.

Mr. COADY rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. FALCONER. No; I have not the time. I think the gentleman ought to give some consideration to a country about which he knows so little. He should study the map and get some idea of the natural resources and the products of the mills in that country and then give those people fair play and bring to their attention the product the Government desires, and in doing that I think he would make a better presiding officer over his committee than he does at the present time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the committee profoundly apologizes for not being familiar with the conditions of the United States, like his more intelligent friend from Washington. However, this matter has been gone over carefully by the committee, and I hold in my hand a list of 255 addresses of paper manufacturers and jobbers throughout the United States to whom notices of lettings are regularly mailed. In addition to that, practically every trade paper in the United States, if it is not in one of these cities where notices are officially published, carries these notices as matters of news, and thereby we get the widest dissemination of this information.

Mr. FALCONER. Where does the gentleman get this list?

Mr. BARNHART. This is a list used by the Joint Committee on Printing.

Mr. FALCONER. Showing the mills manufacturing paper in the United States?

Mr. BARNHART. No; the jobbers and the mills both. If the gentleman from Washington finds that he has a mill in his district that is not represented upon this list, I know the joint committee would be delighted at any time to see that it gets on the list.

Mr. FALCONER. Will the gentleman then please see that there is placed on the list the name of Everett Pulp & Paper Mill, the finest paper manufacturing concern in the United States.

Mr. BARNHART. Certainly.

Mr. GOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARNHART. Yes.

Mr. GOOD. Is it not a fact that most of the Government purchases of coated papers are from mills in Pennsylvania and West Virginia?

Mr. BARNHART. No. On the other hand, I think we get most of it now from Ohio.

Mr. GOOD. Is not the freight rate from a long distance very great?

Mr. BARNHART. Oh, that would be true, no doubt, as to the far West.

Mr. GOOD. As I understand it, the West Virginia Pulp & Paper Co. is one of the largest concerns that furnishes the Gov-

ernment with coated paper. That being true, I wondered why some advertisements were not inserted in that section of the country.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, I could not explain the matter more fully and more intelligently than I have already done.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PAGE of North Carolina, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 15902, and had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following personal requests, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. STAFFORD requests leave of absence for Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin until September 7, 1914, on account of sickness in his family.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FITZGERALD requests leave of absence, on account of illness.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Is the gentleman from New York ill over at the New York convention? I am sorry that he was taken sick there.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a request for leave of absence for Mr. POWERS indefinitely, on account of the illness of his wife and of himself—physician's certificate forwarded.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I desire to file a report from the Committee on Insular Affairs on the bill H. R. 18459, and to ask that permission be given such members of the minority who desire to do so to file minority or individual reports within five days.

Mr. MANN. The report goes in the basket.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands that. The gentleman from Virginia asks that the minority have five days in which to file a report. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. BURKE of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to extend my remarks in the Record on a review of the record of the Democratic Congress and the administration.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks leave to extend his remarks on the record of the Democratic Congress and administration. Is there objection—

Mr. MANN. While I blush for the gentleman, I will not object.

The SPEAKER. The Chair hears none.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 18 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned to meet to-morrow, Thursday, August 27, 1914, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. LOGUE, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to which was referred the bill (S. 3342) for the enlargement, etc., of the Wall Street front of the assay office in the city of New York, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1114), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. JONES, from the Committee on Insular Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 18459) to declare the purpose of the people of the United States as to the future political status of the people of the Philippine Islands, and to provide a more

autonomous government for those islands, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1115), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SMITH of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 18529) providing for the erection of a statue in memory of the life and public service of Gen. John A. Logan; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. WINGO: A bill (H. R. 18530) providing for the issuance of circulating notes to producers of cotton, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BROUSSARD: A bill (H. R. 18531) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to certify to the Secretary of the Interior, for restoration to the public domain, lands in the State of Louisiana not needed for naval purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. KINDEL: A bill (H. R. 18532) to regulate the employment of Government employees by officials, etc.; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. KETTNER: A bill (H. R. 18533) making an appropriation for the protection of Imperial Valley, Cal.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. HOWARD: Resolution (H. Res. 605) to amend Rule XV of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee: Resolution (H. Res. 606) for the consideration of House bill 18459; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 18534) granting an increase of pension to Sylvester Clemings; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOWDLE: A bill (H. R. 18535) granting a pension to Patrick Lysaght; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 18536) granting a pension to William H. Mayo; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DONOHUE: A bill (H. R. 18537) granting an increase of pension to Christiana Hoffman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18538) granting an increase of pension to Mary Coffee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HULL: A bill (H. R. 18539) for the relief of the estate of Wade Baker; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MOSS of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 18540) granting a pension to Cora C. O'Neil; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAUCH: A bill (H. R. 18541) granting a pension to Charles W. Beck; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18542) granting an increase of pension to Emiline Farrar; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18543) granting an increase of pension to Daniel G. Gallion; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18544) granting an increase of pension to Orlando A. Newton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUPLEY: A bill (H. R. 18545) granting an increase of pension to Sallie K. Burkholder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18546) granting an increase of pension to Carrie Sanno; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 18547) granting an increase of pension to Anna Robbins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WALLIN: A bill (H. R. 18548) granting a pension to Mary E. Wilcox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WALSH: A bill (H. R. 18549) for the relief of Frederick Coutier; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of the American Importers' Association of the United States of America, favoring passage of bill for American merchant marine; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also (by request), petition of N. C. Newerf, offering suggestions for the disposition of the Philippines and a solution of the Japanese problem; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Also (by request), petition of N. C. Newerf, relative to bill for Government merchant and naval marine; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BAILEY (by request): Petition of sundry citizens of New York City, favoring enactment of a measure prohibiting the export of food and clothing during the European war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BELL of California: Petition of the General Contractors' Association of San Francisco, Cal., protesting against the passage of House bill 14288, relative to mechanical equipment of Government buildings being segregated; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, petition of the Pasadena (Cal.) Board of Labor, relative to the establishment of food stations in all the important cities of the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the Building Trades Employers' Association, the Sheet Metal Contractors' Association, the Master House-smiths' Association, the Master Roofers and Manufacturers' Association, all of San Francisco, Cal., protesting against the passage of the Clayton bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of Montezuma Tribe, No. 77, Improved Order of Red Men, of San Francisco, and San Francisco Parlor, No. 49, Native Sons of the Golden West, and Ralph W. Black, of Monrovia, all in the State of California, favoring the passage of House bill 5139, relative to retirement of aged employees of the Government; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. BRUCKNER: Petition of William Hickey, of New York City, favoring passage of American merchant-marine bill; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of the Champion Iron Co., of Merton, Ohio, protesting against the passage of Senate bill 5147, to investigate the claims of the Clinton-Marshall Construction Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DAVENPORT: Petition of the Keetonah Society of Cherokee Indians, asking for an accounting between the Indians and the United States; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. GARDNER: Petition of Patrick F. Creed and 50 other citizens, of Haverhill, Mass., protesting against the rise in the price of foodstuffs; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: Memorial of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, expressing to President Wilson its profound gratitude of his action in offering the services of the United States in mediation between the European powers; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GRIEST: Memorial of the Ephrata (Pa.) Branch of the Socialist Party, protesting against European war, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Petition of Alva E. Belmont, of Newport, R. I., favoring the submitting of amendment for woman suffrage at this session of Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LONERGAN: Petition of the city council of the city of Bristol, Conn., for thorough investigation regarding the high prices of foodstuffs since the commencement of the European war; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: Petition of William Pestel, of Providence, R. I., protesting against the passage of House bill 17353, relating to use of the mails in effecting insurance on persons and property, etc.; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. RAKER: Petition of the General Contractors' Association of San Francisco, Cal., protesting against the passage of House bill 14288, relative to segregating mechanical equipment of United States Government buildings; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, memorial of San Francisco Parlor, No. 49, Native Sons of the Golden West, and Montezuma Tribe, No. 77, Improved Order of Red Men, favoring the passage of House bill 5139, relative to retirement of aged employees of the Government; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, petition of the Western Association of Retail Cigar Dealers, protesting against any further taxation on cigars, tobacco, or cigarettes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WATSON: Petitions of sundry citizens of Dinwiddie, Sussex, Amelia, Greenville, Lunenburg, and Prince Edward Counties, all in the State of Virginia, relative to rural credits; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WEAVER: Petitions of sundry citizens of Gracemont, Yeager, Lokeba, Walter, Colbert, Lamar, Coalton, Allen, and Dewar, and of the counties of Ottawa, Oklahoma, and Lincoln, all in the State of Oklahoma, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on Rules.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, August 27, 1914.

(Legislative day of Tuesday, August 25, 1914.)

The Senate reassembled at 11 o'clock a. m. on the expiration of the recess.

PROPOSED ANTITRUST LEGISLATION.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate resumes the consideration of the unfinished business, which is House bill 15657.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 15657) to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, there are about half a dozen Senators in the Chamber, and I think we ought to have a quorum. I therefore suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Dillingham	Myers	Sterling
Bankhead	Fletcher	Norris	Thornton
Brady	Gallinger	Overman	Vardaman
Bryan	Jones	Perkins	Walsh
Burton	Kenyon	Pittman	West
Camden	Kern	Polindexter	White
Clapp	McLean	Sheppard	
Culberson	Martin, Va.	Smith, Ga.	
Cummins	Martine, N. J.	Smoot	

Mr. THORNTON. I was requested to announce the necessary absence of the junior Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN] and to state that he is paired with the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER]. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Thirty-three Senators have answered to the roll call. There is not a quorum present. The Secretary will call the roll of absentees.

The Secretary called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. RANDELL, Mr. SIMMONS, and Mr. THOMPSON answered to their names when called.

Mr. SMOOT. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. SUTHERLAND]. He has a general pair with the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. CLARKE]. I will allow this announcement to stand for the day.

Mr. CHILTON, Mr. SHIELDS, and Mr. REED entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I desire to announce the continued absence of my colleague [Mr. PAGE], he being detained in Vermont on account of illness in his family.

Mr. GORE entered the Chamber and answered to his name.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Forty Senators have answered to the roll call. There is no quorum present. The Sergeant at Arms will carry out the instructions of the Senate heretofore given and request the attendance of absent Senators.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. FALL, Mr. SHAFER, Mr. HOLLISS, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. McCUMBER, Mr. LANE, Mr. POMERENE, Mr. LEE of Maryland, and Mr. HITCHCOCK entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-one Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present. The Secretary will state the pending amendment.

Mr. CULBERSON. On page 10 of the bill, an amendment, proposed by the committee, to strike out the penalty clause, was passed over at the suggestion of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS].

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In section 8, on page 10, the committee amendment proposing to strike out lines 22, 23, 24, and 25 was passed over. The lines read as follows:

A violation of any of the provisions of this section shall be deemed a misdemeanor, and shall be punishable by a fine not exceeding \$5,000, or by imprisonment not exceeding one year, or by both, in the discretion of the court.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I have just returned to the Chamber, and I heard only the latter part of the proposition now before the Senate read, but as I understand that proposition it is to strike out the language on lines 22 to 25, on page 10, which reads:

A violation of any of the provisions of this section shall be deemed a misdemeanor and shall be punishable by a fine not exceeding \$5,000, or by imprisonment not exceeding one year, or by both, in the discretion of the court.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President—

Mr. REED. I wish to inquire if that is the proposition before the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is the pending question. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Alabama?